This notion of marking has been formally developed by Geohegan (1969). He has found, in working on alternations in address forms, that one can identify a regular, expected, reportable, unmarked form which is predictable from social features such as setting, age, rank, sex, and so on. This would correspond to register or situational or unmarked style as used above. Deviations from the unmarked alternatives carry social information such as positive and negative affect, deference, and anger. These are Gumperz' metaphorical switches. Kernan's monitoring carries information because it deviates from the speaker's usual style in that situation. In her examples the information concerned attitudes toward addressees or persons referred to or quoted. Since these changes in speech are often unconscious, they can only be studied from taped natural conversations, not from informant reports.

It should be clear from this discussion of registers, styles, marking, and monitoring that these concepts are still being developed and changed and that attention to them will be fundamental in any research on children's understanding of the social aspects of language. Since work has been done largely with adults, we do not know how young and under what social conditions it is possible for speakers to show register or style variability in their speech.

My guess is that the first social features that will appear are major setting and addressee contrasts, since we find very early that bilingual children change language according to locations and persons. Martin Edelman, for example, examined the relation between reports of the expected language for given settings, and dominance as judged by fluency in emitting words in a particular language associated with a given setting. The children were Puerto Rican bilinguals in New York, 6 to 12. The pattern did not change with age, merely the amount of English dominance. Children knew significantly more English words for education and religion, but not for family and home.[8] Church, school, and home are unambiguous settings, for which dominant language was reportable by the children.

In addition when children role-play they often adopt consistent speech patterns in accordance with the social categories involved -- mothers and babies, doctors, cowboys, teachers, puppets. These situational patterns are relatively stereotyped but do reveal quite early

use of language with consistent feature changes. What we do not know is what features change and what social cues can be generalized beyond particular persons.

The instances we have observed of speech variation for intent may not yet be socially conventionalized in young children -- for example, regressive infantile speech as a marker for dependency, imitations of syntactic simplifications of the addressee when explaining to a foreigner.

We know that consistent code changes in second languages can be learned very rapidly early. Edward Hernandex, in Berkeley, has been studying a Chicano monolingual of three who became relatively bilingual within six months from nursery school exposure, though his English at that time was considerably simpler than his Spanish. We do not know how early or under what social conditions completely consistent control over the situational selection of two social dialects can be mastered. Part of the problem is that we know relatively little about the linguistic features of such competence.

Stylistic consistency. In the more formal types of situations, bilinguals can learn relatively separated codes. Even metaphorical switching tends to be at fairly high syntactic nodes, if both lexical alternatives are available to the speaker (i.e. he doesn't have to use vocabulary from one variety since he lacks words). Some bilinguals even have a range of formal to informal styles in both codes (Gumperz, 1967, 1968).

One of the major differences between the variation found in bilinguals and in speakers with forms from various social dialects has been forcefully argued by Kernan (1969). She points out that there seems to be a lack of co-occurrence restriction in the samples of black speech. One changes register or monitors by increasing or decreasing the frequency of certain variables, sometimes categorically. But if one examines the variables which show stylistic variation, one finds the variants side-by-side, without many contingent relations between them. In the same clause one finds BE and a possessive suffix, copula deletion and consonant clusters in lower-class black speakers.

Labov, who has examined both individual and group styles in teen-age and adult Harlem speakers, has been impressed by the inconsistency of their formal style features, especially in the formal test situations typical of schools. "Whenever a subordinate dialect is in contact with a superordinate dialect, answers given in any formal test situation will shift from the subordinate towards the superordinate in an irregular and unsystematic manner" (1968). Claudia Kernan also found, in classroom correction tests, that students had no stable notions of what the standard alternative was among the alternatives in their repertoire. Labov, McKay, Henrie, Kernan, and indeed everyone who has collected considerable samples of speech of dialect speakers have found that the full range of most standard forms will appear some time in their speech. That is, the problem of standard speech is in most cases not that the form is outside the repertoire but that the speaker cannot maintain a consistent choice of standard alternatives and not make slips. There is inadequate co-occurrence restriction between the standard forms whether they are dialect borrowings or not (Wolfram, 1969).

This is what we would expect if in fact the features that standard speakers use to identify standard and non-standard speech are often used for metaphorical signalling by non-standard speakers. They may hear a higher density of standard features as carrying a particular connotation in a given situation. But some features are not varied for this kind of meaning, and since various combinations of features co-occur there is no strong sense that any consistent style is required. In addition, there is considerable "inherent variation" according to Labov's work, which may not carry any connotations at all. In standard English this inherent variation is not heard as marking the speaker as incompetent in standard English, but since in non-standard English the variation includes features which are criterial to listeners' judgments of standardness, it appears socially to be inconsistent.

In advising parents who rear bilingual children it is usual to point out that they should maintain consistency of speaker, occasion, or setting so that the child can be aided in predicting which form

to use. But in the case of non-standard English the great bulk of the informal styles heard in the community by children contain a high degree of variability between standard and non-standard features, since the variability is inherent in the dialect. A child who is to maintain a consistent choice of the standard alternative must mark it categorically in his storage, or at least have some linkages between forms which will make sequential occurrence of standard forms seem normal for him. If the child heard pure standard or non-standard forms this learning would not be a problem. He would learn the standard style as a second language with as brief and trivial interference as we normally find in immigrant children.[9] But this is not what he hears. He hears highly variable speech lacking in co-occurrence restrictions or predictability from segment to segment, at least at the grammatical level. Small wonder that many speakers are very uncertain as to which is standard and cannot do classroom correction tests comfortably.

This line of thinking leads me to an outlandish proposal. If the problem is to identify "pure styles" and to store them with sufficient separateness to permit stylistic consistency, might it not be appropriate to help identify them by using "monitoring styles" of a sort, by having children role-play, parody, or use narrative styles in which a relatively extreme non-standard without inherent variation on key features might seem appropriate and the other children could call them on failures? The converse would of course be role-playing journalist, doctor, legislator, and so on in standard English grammar. The social appropriateness of such a move in a school might very well be questioned by parents who believe the school is the place for standard English, but such games might enhance maximum adeptness in style switching. There is of course some precedent for permitting and encouraging a range of styles in dramatic play, even in school.

In courses helping adolescents in mastering register changes, Waterhouse (1968) has found that even students who did not regularly speak standard English were as a group critical of press releases in a role-played press conference if they contained non-standard features like copula deletion. The group itself, without pressure from the

teacher, exerted constraints on role-players to keep a consistent register. The method releases the actor from teasing about talking standard English, and potentially may be transferred to situations where the teacher is not present.

The practice of giving students drills in standard English, which has developed in some schools, is based on the assumption that the variants do not exist in their repertoire. Where the variants do exist in the child's repertoire already, and where some already are markers of social meaning, the teacher has a special problem, quite different from that of basic second-language learning. The teacher needs to find the most effective way to give a child training in situational switching which will allow him to use the forms in writing, and in speech situations where he may be affected by fatigue, fear, and by concentration on the content of what he is saying. That seems to be what parents want to happen.

Comprehension of features. One underpinning of studies of the possibilities of variation in produced speech is better evidence on what features children can hear. Because of the evidence that many variants occur freely if unpredictably in children's output, it is sometimes assumed that all children understand all features of standard English. Jane Torrey's work (1969) is a model in studying these problems. She found that sibilant suffixes had markedly different probabilities of being understood or produced depending on their grammatical functions. Almost all the black children in her Harlem sample understood a plural suffix and produced it regularly, almost none understood or produced a verb suffix marking number, as in "the cat scratches" vs. "the cats scratch," and about half understood and produced the copula, the possessive, and the verb suffix denoting tense, as in "the boy shut the door" vs. "the boy shuts the door." Torrey has not reported the performances of children who usually hear standard English, to see if some developmental factors are present. This study, of course, isolates the features from contextual redundancy, as one must to discover whether a particular linguistic cue can be interpreted alone. The kind of evidence that Labov, Kernan, Baratz, and others have obtained

showing that in imitation tasks children translate into their own dialect may be insufficient tests of comprehension of particular features, since the sentences contain redundancy. For example, Baratz found that white children translated "I's some toys out there" into "there are some toys out there," and black children often did the reverse. But this does not indicate that either group "understood" the first words, rather that the rest of the utterance made obligatory this form in their output. Error analysis of imitation materials with less redundancy would discover what syntactic and morphological features are employed. Torrey's findings are not inconsistent with the important fact that in everyday situations most standard English may be intelligible grammatically to black lower-class children, since in many situations language is redundant.[10]

A recent study by Weener (1969) attempted to separate phonology from whatever semantic and syntactic sequential probabilities are tested by memory for "orders of approximation" to English. From the standpoint of syntactic differences, this method gives rather gross results and is unlikely to be sensitive to whatever syntactic differences occur in the formal output of lower-class black and middle-class white informants. The interesting finding in this study was that when asked to remember these strings of words, the lower-class black children and middle-class whites did equally well with the materials read by a middle-class speaker, but the whites had trouble remembering the same materials read by a black speaker. That is, just as we might expect on social grounds, black children have more exposure to middle-class white phonology and can interpret it more easily than the suburban Detroit white children could interpret southern black speech.[11]

The Weener results remind us that the critical factors in adjusting to phonological differences, as in adjusting to "foreign accents," is likely to be experience and attitude toward the speaker. Studies of the mutual intelligibility of speakers in varieties of social settings allowing for both differences in contacts and in types of speech exposure and for differences in social attitudes

towards the other group would inform us about factors causing changes in intelligibility in our pluralistic society. These studies need to focus on comprehension as such, not output measures like the Cloze procedure, and it would be helpful if they would distinguish fine-grained feature interpretation (as of the plural marker as in Torrey's work) from grosser referential intelligibility and the understanding of allusion and metaphor.

One of the most significant findings in Kernan's work and in recent studies of John Gumperz is that there is considerable informational or connotative content in choice among referential equivalents in the speaker's repertoire. A full competence in comprehending the speech of others includes these social interpretations. So far, most research on information-transmission has been focused on shapes, colors, and locations rather than on the equally systematic communication of hostility, affection, and deference. It is possible that the latter matters are of greater practical significance, for example in the classroom where teacher and pupil need to communicate respect for each other. If teachers cannot understand when a pupil makes a conciliatory move, for instance, disaster could follow.

Subjective reaction tests. Along with studies of comprehension, we need more information about children's attitudes towards speech varieties and their sense of norms of register and style. There have been numerous studies in which people rate voices out of context (except of topic) by Labov (1966, 1968), Tucker and Lambert, and Williams (in press), for example. Such ratings necessarily tend to be of people or categories of people, since this is all the information the listeners can discover. It turns out to be the case, when specific features used in ratings are examined, that listeners tend to give "categorical" judgments, as Labov first pointed out. They will judge intelligence, ambition, and honesty just from "accent." They do not react to frequencies reliably, but as June McKay (1969) has suggested, tend to pick out the "lowest" ranked social feature, even if it is rare, as an indicator of the speaker's social ranking -- provided, of course, it is not contextually accounted for as "marking," such as parody, irony, humor. Williams has found that teachers tend to judge

race from a few features. Triandis, Loh, and Levin (1966) and Lambert's work (1967) implies teachers will then treat the children by their group stereotype. From a practical standpoint, knowing which features are perceptually critical might help those who aim at giving the children the option of not always being ethnically identifiable from phonology.

One of the fundamental ideas in sociolinguistics, as emphasized earlier, is that speech in fact and in its norms is context-sensitive. We accept baby-talk to infants but not to adolescents. As a measure of children's development of style norms, judgments of the sort just discussed need to be made where the social context is made clear in some way. It remains to be seen how children react to anomalies -- by laughter, criticism, imitation perhaps. Children as young as five will criticize others doing role-playing for using the wrong terminology for the role, e.g. "You can't say 'honey': you're the baby." Such studies are the judgmental analogue of the role-playing method of studying actually produced style and register changes, and the two kinds of studies should be paired to permit study of the extent to which judgments are finer than ability to produce the forms critical to the judgments. Labov (1964) has found that by mid-teens speakers who did not themselves produce the most formal alternatives in New York phonology shared the opinion of the rest of the population on what variants were socially higher.

Kernan has commented that certain genres of folk literature, such as songs, poetry, narratives, would be ludicrous in standard English, and Labov (1961) found that childhood rhymes forced use of the most casual vernacular. It would be of great value to know how sensitive children are to these social co-occurrence constraints, especially on genres brought in use from outside the school to enlarge the children's fluency in the classroom. If they react to some kinds of performances as sounding wrong in standard English, or vice-versa -- if some require standard English -- then efforts by the teacher to mismatch these types of discourse with the wrong style may make the children uncomfortable and silent. For these reasons studies of judgments may help guide teachers toward culturally appropriate varieties of language.

Social class differences in transmission of referential information may be a function of "set". If so they can be easily changed by instruction or brief training. Studies by Cowan (1967), and Coulthard and Robinson (1968) and Robinson (in press) suggest that they are to some degree. The effects of social different ways of viewing the function of the act asked of them, or the "rules of the game." It is possible of course that skill in the particular domain of vocabulary or previous experience with materials might aid in such performances too.

Of considerable value to sociolinguistic work are studies of skills developed by children in language. For example, children often spontaneously play with sounds, in the pre-school years, and invite games transforming songs by simplified transformations like Pig-Latin. Where these skills become socially organized, they may develop into identifiable speech categories: nursery rhymes, songs, sounding, toasting, rifting, or rapping. These, in some cases, include oral traditions, knowledge of which is part of the developing competence of children. These may include not only general stylistic features but sequential rules. Children's skill is repeatedly evaluated by peers and highly appreciated. Houston (1969) has argued that lack of toys among the rural poor whom she studied resulted in more story-telling, language games, and more value on linguistic creativity, spontaneous narrative, and improvisation. Having recently seen a group of forty highly-educated adults and their children around a campfire without even one person skilled enough to carry on story-telling, I can believe education can produce cultural impoverishment!

Analysis of the structure of communication within communities could make us better able to draw events from children's repertoire into the schools, better able to use them in testing competence in identifying biologically-based retardation, and better able to understand how children interpret tasks they are given to do. Within these speech categories, stylistic variations involving the standard-non-standard dimensions are important carriers of emotional significance. The ability to convey meaning depends on this range of variation. We can expect that as children have contact with members of varied social groups they will learn skill in a wider range of speech categories, learn each other's oral traditions, and learn devices

Functions of language. One of the major issues that has come to the fore in sociolinguistics and in applied work in education has been the question of varieties of language function. Bernstein (in press) has pointed out that in England middle-class parents train children in a considerable amount of explicitness about referents, as though they were talking to a stranger or blind person, and no shared assumptions obtained. The result of this training (possibly through the use of known-answer question drills) is that children perform verbal tasks very well in test situations with minimal verbal stimulation. The difference in stress on over-elaboration of detail versus terseness of description, based on shared assumptions, shows up in a variety of studies. Hawkins found that lower-class English children described pictures with many "exophoric" pronouns, which required that the listener see the picture, as indeed he did. Middle-class pupils elaborated nouns and adjectives which specified information the examiner must already have known from seeing the picture. Williams and Naremore (1969) found that when children were asked to be specific, class differences disappeared. But when terse questions were asked, the middle class assumed they should give complicated elaborate answers, the lower class that only minimal necessary responses were needed. Labov has cited examples illustrating the bewilderment of a child taken into a room by a tester and told to "say what is in front of you" when both the tester and the child can see quite well what it is.

The implication of course is that children may have learned that the function of such communication is to convey information. If they have not been brought up on "known-answer" questions and taught to display their vocabulary and disregard whether the hearer knows the information, they may not understand the intent of such questions.

Kernan described such an incident during her study of the speech of Oakland black youngsters. She asked one child "Where do you live?" and got a vague answer: "Over there" with a vaguely waved thumb. Shortly later Kernan's husband asked the same question. The answer he got was "You go down the stairs, turn left, walk three blocks..." What was the difference? The husband had never been to the child's house -- but Kernan herself had picked the child up there.

for conveying information about social intent from each other's dialects. Labov has pointed out that the black children he studied valued language highly for cleverness in besting others; this attitude, if fully understood by teachers, could, he proposed, be a basis for enlarging language competence.

Research Suggestions

1. Tests were developed in schools to predict success in schools as they were constituted and to assess achievements of the school. The need to compare the achievements of school entities, and to pass the blame for failures onto the child, will unfortunately probably guarantee that tests will continue to be used even when they are not needed for fundamental diagnosis. Diagnosis of biologically based retardation, assuming we have means of pedagogically treating such retardation, is an important function of tests. If this is to be done well, there is a need for tests of basic milestones in competence which contain materials equated in dialect and social biases for the populations to be tested.

In contrast to previous attempts at culture-free testing, sociolinguistic research gives hope of finding how to create communicative settings, tasks, language, and scoring criteria that are fully compatible with the experience of the tested children and are validated within their own social group in cases of fairly clear group differences. Of course, ethnic and class categories do not bound homogeneous groups, so it is not clear in a diverse classroom which it is appropriate to choose from a package of tests labeled lower-class black, middle-class black, Chicano, and so on. But at least such a pluralistic set might take us beyond the current middle-class white package!

As an example of the improvements of testing and teaching materials which might be gained from a realistic orientation to children's language use, we might cite the weaknesses of reading workbooks and tests. Items which rest on "comparing initial sound" or "rhyming words" depend on the probabilities that children will produce a very specific item of vocabulary for a given picture. They don't work as teaching materials or as valid tests unless the children do in fact "mediate"

with these vocabulary items. Sensitive teachers have noticed repeatedly that a large proportion of these items do not elicit the expected names. The differences may be even larger where environmental and social differences exist. Such items are useless for teaching or testing. Another example is the section in reading recognition tests of word lists which are to be matched to pictures. Even if the words are read aloud, the items in some cases cannot be matched. But in this sutuation children rely on a single mediated name of the picture more than adults do. Probably such tests are not tests of reading. In paragraph comprehension items, the syntax and content is often such that even if it were read aloud the child could not understand it. Such a test is not a test of reading skill. The evidence that children speaking social dialects cannot read may be largely based on invalid measures of reading ability. Of course, the effects of this evidence may be self-fulfilling, if teachers believe dialect speakers have trouble learning to read.

2. We need much more work on the social conditions which alter the frequency of social variants in speech. We need work with children to see what the social factors are which increase and decrease ethnic identity markers in their speech at different ages. It is not clear whether the monitoring of ethnic solidarity which Kernan describes has parallels in social categories like "working class" where there are no sharp socially-defined boundaries. But there probably are parallels in all groups to the increase in vernacular usage under excitement that Labov has found.

3. We need to extend sociolinguistic work to a wider variety of groups. The problems of urban schools have, for practical reasons, led to a focus on black, Puerto Rican, and Chicano groups. However, developmental sociolinguistics is appropriate to any child; upper class children have stylistic variation in their speech too, and can be studied to gain basic information about age changes in the structure and function of speech variation. Any groups speaking non-standard English are equally appropriate for the study of the relations between standard and non-standard; areas of regional migration allow for group

identity marking through speech variables (e.g. southern white migrants in various social classes in Detroit). Since the social and the linguistic factors are slightly different in each of these groups, better generalizations about basic processes would be available if the range of groups studied were extended. There is a practical factor; such work is always contingent on collaboration or principal direction by in-group members.

4. We need to explore teaching methods for increasing competence in code-switching and to find out the ages at which different methods are suitable for teaching. At present, unfortunately most research on second-language learning has been so atheoretical and ad hoc that we know very little of basic relevance to questions of how different features of language can be learned. Role playing, developing of tasks with appropriate registers that the children themselves recognize and reinforce (e.g. Waterhouse) are examples of possible methods to use. It is not clear when formal instruction, drills, individual tutoring, peer group learning, teaching by older children from the same social group might be most effective. How does one learn appropriate frequencies where there is inherent variation, vs. the learning of categorical features?

One of the problems in suggesting changes in educational methods is the lack of close study of actual classroom interaction. Teachers are not conscious of the methods they use. Tapes and videotapes can provide a way to locate the effective features of current methods, methods chosen post hoc as most effective, or methods used in experimental studies. Since communication is not merely verbal, videotapes may considerably enrich our ability to interpret what happens in the classroom.

5. We need far more studies like Torrey's exploring fully the range of comprehension of specific features of various types of English to various types of listeners. It would be of value to know whether teachers understand their pupils, for example, in terms of specific grammatical features.

6. We need to explore the place of reading and writing in the linguistic life of the child. Labov found many Harlem teenagers did not know if their close friends were literate. Literacy was not

necessary for the activities of the boys. Exploration of children's values about language might lead to ways of devising uses of language and specifically reading for beginners that are relevant to interests they already have; later one hopes new interests arising from what they read will carry them further.

It is not clear how important type of language is in reading; adults frequently have strong attitudes that only a standard English is appropriate for reading. Navahos have not been especially receptive to efforts to make a written language of Navaho; English is for writing. Schools, of course, are not immune from adult community pressures; if it could be shown that literacy in the vernacular clearly aids literacy in standard English then the adults might be persuadable.

7. We need to explore in detail the structural relations between the child's oral comprehension skills, his speech, and reading and writing. I know of no evidence that learning to understand written language (as contrasted with reading aloud) is generally affected by the child's dialect of English. Labov has pointed out that the underlying form is in many cases the same for standard and non-standard words and merely deletion rules apply. All children need to learn the relation between deletion and the spelled form; all English speakers learn there is no one-to-one relation between spelling to sound, and to depend to some extent on some sight vocabulary or contextual guessing. In other parts of the world where children speak a highly valued local dialect learning to read a standard is no problem.

Two directions of research need exploration. One might be to explore the issues of comprehension apart from reading aloud(which has to be unlearned later anyway). If part of the problem is the social one of punishment by teachers who do not recognize when speech is the child's equivalent of what is written, the teacher's judgment either must be changed or by-passed. In effect one would teach children to decode written symbols to their meanings via the path of hearing spoken words with what they read at first. Children would of course engage in sotto voce articulation while reading but they would not be directly punished or rewarded for this vocal behavior.

A second possibility would be better investigation of the relation between standard English and the child's comprehension and production. We could test the child's specific feature knowledge as Torrey has done, and build materials related in systematic ways to this knowledge. I am not persuaded that dialect speakers are unique in having difficulties decoding inflectional suffixes in listening or reading. Labov has evidence that white boys as well as blacks do not readily interpret the -ed suffix in reading as a past tense indicator, especially in early adolescence and pre-adolescence. In cases where such grammatical features are not readily understood, they may not normally interfere with comprehension, given the redundancy of most texts, but they clearly are important in marginal cases and in writing. Specific instructional materials could focus on these issues.

Joan Baratz and William Stewart have proposed that children will learn to read faster if the grammatical structures used in primers are derived from their own output (Baratz and Shuy, 1969) or are structurally similar. Such materials could of course be prepared by teachers from stories told by the children with lexical normalization of spelling but not of syntax. We need detailed research with appropriate controls. With content and vocabulary controlled, does a child learn faster if the grammatical structures used come from his own output? What if they are like his most standard forms? His most non-standard forms (as in the Baratz materials)? Variable, as verbatim materials would be? It is clear that different content[13], different grammar but conventionalized orthography, different vocabulary and concept familiarity might all be at issue and should be studied separately.

Case histories of learning to read with details of teacher-child inter-action might help us locate points of difficulty and develop better theories of the reading process, and more important, better teacher-training methods. It is to be hoped that detailed recordings will be available of children's performance as they learn to read the Baratz-Stewart materials.

It is quite possible that the structural features of the materials in terms of dialect are not important in themselves, given that children

understand most standard English structures and that many differences are superficial. Teachers and supervisors who have worked in many schools with dialect speakers complain that the fundamental problem is that many middle-class teachers do not believe that poor children, especially dialect speakers, can easily learn to read. I could list a variety of types of behavior to lower-class children which have been seen that could be the kinds of discouraging cues that children emotionally understand, or that more directly reduce the opportunity of the child to learn. There are dramatic examples of teachers who have brought below-average IQ slum children to the third grade level in reading while in first grade. We need to identify and videotape the teaching methods of such teachers and locate by experiment what are the key features of their method, and then teach with these videotapes.

If the Baratz-Stewart materials do result in faster learning, one reason might be their effects on teacher attitudes. If teachers believe the child has a language and a culture of his own that they themselves do not fully understand they are less likely to treat him as "deficient." This may be a key difference in attitudes toward immigrant children and native ethnic minorities. One cannot teach this lesson by exhortation; teachers who begin to realize the children know something they don't know may respect the children more. Therefore research on the effects of teaching materials should include some sensitive indices (perhaps of the Lambert speech guise type) of changes in social attitudes towards dialect speakers on the part of teachers and administrators.

8. We need more research on the development of children's subjective reactions to language. How early, and by what features, do they identify categories of speaker? Are there sex differences, as so many studies have shown, in the direction of greater preference for and use of formal variants in girls? How early can children differentiate the standard English of various ethnic groups? How do they evaluate it?

9. How do norms of appropriateness of speech variables to situation and meaning develop? While we know that children produce "baby talk intonation" to babies when they are as young as 20 months old, we do not know how soon they react to misplaced baby talk as anomalous, or judge meanings on the basis of speech variables.

10. We need to explore for practical as well as theoretical reasons ways of training teachers to understand non-standard speech. John Gumperz has made two proposals along these lines. One is that systematic non-standard dialects be taught as second languages to teachers. The purpose would not be that the teachers produce these forms in the classroom, but that by learning them as "second languages" teachers would be brought to recognize their systematic character and to understand how they convey meaning. I believe also, from work on second-language teaching, that there might be a very strong attitudinal impact on the teachers. Learning a second language through methods of close imitation of native speakers is a dramatic personal experience. Success in imitation (within the range of adult articulatory rigidity) might be a sensitive measure of intergroup attitudes.

The second method proposed by Gumperz would be similar to some "sensitivity training" methods. Taped interaction between two groups of pupils, or of teachers and pupils would be selected showing misunderstanding of the meaning of linguistic features and/or stylistic variation. For instance, suppose an excited child used more dialect features and the teacher heard these as hostile. Two groups of listeners could separately be asked to make judgments about the social meaning of each utterance. The differences in these judgments would bring to light systems of meaning that are not the same in the two groups, and allow some learning about humor, irony, and insult.

11. We need to know more about the impact on children's attitudes of teacher's use of the vernacular in the classroom. Some programs are already systematically teaching, for instance "Pocho" to teachers.[14] In the case of non-standard black features, Kernan's work suggests that non-standard features out of context may have implications of ridicule, as for example if non-standard grammar is used without associated phonological and paralinguistic features. Yet Baratz' method of teaching reading implies that the teacher knows how to speak non-standard English appropriately.

12. We need to know how stylistic consistency with co-occurrence constraints can be learned since children hear speech which is variable at home and among their friends. A good deal needs to be known about

whether role-playing can increase consistency, and whether a bi-polar contrast between two relatively consistent "codes" is required or optimal for developing separately stored features lexically, phonologically, and syntactically. The practical implications of more work on the learning of co-occurrence rules are considerable.

Notes

1. The ideas in this paper have been influenced considerably by discussions with John Gumperz, to whom I have not always given due credit. Participants in the conference will recognize that many suggestions during the discussion have been incorporated here in the interests of preserving them. They were so much group products that I am not sure how to attribute them. I have received many insightful suggestions about primary school classroom problems from teachers and former teachers, including particularly Eileen Green, Herbert Kohl, Mary Jamieson, and Mary Suzuki.

2. For theoretical discussions of communicative competence, see Hymes (n.d.). For some research suggestions regarding developmental sociolinguistics, see Slobin (1967). The term "sociolinguistic" rather than "communicative" is used here to exclude the many forms of skill in non-linguistic communication which also undergo development, and show up at an earlier age than conventional linguistic communication.

3. With biological abnormalities we include birth damage, damage arising from malnutrition in gestation or infancy, damage from malnutrition of the maternal grandmother during pregnancy, damage from chronic illnesses, as well as genetically based brain deficiencies. From a social engineering standpoint it is important of course to differentiate these sources since something can be done about malnutrition, illness, and the higher incidence of birth damage among the poor.

4. Stewart (in press) in particular has argued strongly that the number and importance of grammatical differences between non-standard black English and any form of standard English is greater, for historical reasons, than other social dialect differences.

5. For further discussion of these points see Hymes (1964) and Ervin-Tripp (1964). The further development of the importance of repertoire in social meaning has been in the work of John Gumperz (Blom and Gumperz, in press, Gumperz (1967, 1964).

6. A striking finding of this study was that speakers valued the local vernacular highly and could not believe that they employed standard Norwegian words and features for certain kinds of speech. The relation between the vernacular and a standard has been an

educational issue in many parts of the world; studies in other places might often be relevant to developmental issues in the United States.

7. A vivid example of completely unconscious marking which was not a direct imitation appeared in Labov's study of Lower East side New York speech (1964, p. 97). A Negro without ethnically distinctive speech told a story about a dangerous experience. In the dialogue he included, he represented his own speech in his typical unmarked casual style, but he also represented the speech of the person he feared, since he was supposed to have threatened someone with a gun. This voice was rasping and rapid, with rough southern Negro features. He later reported that the other person was --- Hungarian!

8. The discrepancy between the children's report about neighborhood language, which they rated as predominantly Spanish, and their work fluency scores, which were significantly greater in English for the task of naming objects in the neighborhood, illustrates the problems of using tests rather than recordings of natural conversation. It is possible that most "doorstep conversations" common in the Puerto Rican neighborhoods were in Spanish, but that vocabulary for nameable shops and objects was English primarily, and likewise that considerable English was in fact used in conversations which speakers believed were normally, expectedly in Spanish. John Gumperz (1967) has particularly emphasized the difference between questionnaire answers and actual behavior.

9. We distinguish immigrant children here from children in those bilingual communities where the same conditions of admixture of English and other forms may obtain in some cases. Many instances have been observed in which bilinguals cannot identify the language of provenance of a form because it is used in both their codes.

10. This statement may sound over-optimistic. There are many registers outside of the everyday experience of most people. With more open enrollment in universities, some students may encounter, for the first time, with discouraging results, lecturers who use complex nominalizations, and unusual types of sentence embeddings, in addition to new vocabulary and subject matter. The assumption that syntactic learning ends in childhood is not socially realistic, but there has been little systematic study of complex registers.

11. In studies which disconnect syntax from phonology, there is a serious confounding because of the likelihood of some co-occurrence rules between the two levels. Non-standard syntax with "standard" phonology is bizarre and quite different in meaning from non-standard syntax and congruent phonology. In the same way, the

standard syntax and stereotyped stage non-standard phonology employed by Stern and Kieslar (1968) was so bizarre a combination black children could not understand it very well. In the Weener study the syntax had no clear identity, and the black speaker's phonology was a natural formal reading style.

12. In some features there is a slight increase during adolescence. We can expect the peer culture will alter norms and that the progress from childhood to adult status will be affected not only by increasing knowledge in which children become more like adults, but by the effects of strongly age-graded attitudes and also by generational changes in norms that remain with the teenagers when they are adults.

13. Some primers have simply painted the faces of children for minority readers. A deeper change might entail using the kinds of names and nicknames actually in use, culture content of interest to the children, but more important still thematic cores that engage the children. At this conference, it was pointed out that black children like the Five Chinese Brothers because they are rewarded for cleverness, which is highly valued in black culture. It was mentioned that Ping, about a duck lost from his flock on a Chinese junk, appealed to Navahos. The metaphor of the flock of ducks is parallel to the flock of sheep which is the core of traditional Navaho material values. At least, one should not assume that such superficial features as geographical location is primary in a child's interest or his sense of "relevance".

14. For instance, a current program for Chicano teachers at Sacramento State College.

References

Baratz, Joan C. A bi-dialectal task for determining language proficiency in economically disadvantaged Negro children. Child Development, 1969, 40, 889-902.

----- and Shuy, Roger W. Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D.C. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Bernstein, B. A socio-linguistic approach to socialization: with some references to educability. In J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, in press.

Blom, J.P. and Gumperz, J.J. Some social determinants of verbal behavior. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), Directions in sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, in press.

-----. On the linguistic markers of bilingual communication. In J Macnamara (ed.), Problems of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, Pt. 2, 48-57.

Hawkins, P.R. Social class, the nominal group and reference. Language and Speech, 1969.

Heider, E. Style and effectiveness of children's verbal communications within and between social classes. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

Henrie, S.N. A study of verb phrases used by five year old nonstandard Negro English speaking children. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

Houston, Susan. A sociolinguistic consideration of the Black English of children in northern Florida. Language, 1969, 45, 599-607.

Hymes, D. Toward ethnographies of communication. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, Pt. 2, No. 6, 1-34.

-----. On communicative competence. Unpublished manuscript.

Jensen, A.R. How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 1969, 39, 1-124.

Kernan, Claudia M. Language behavior in a black urban community. University of California, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Laboratory Working Paper No. 23 (Ph.D. dissertation), 1969.

-----. The acquisition of language by Samoan children. University of California, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Laboratory Working Paper No. 21 (Ph.D. disseration), 1969.

Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.

-----. Stages in the acquisition of standard English. In R. Shuy (ed.), Social dialects and language learning. Champaign, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965.

-----. The study of language in its social context. Studium Generale (in press).

-----, Cohen, P., Robins, C., and Lewis, J. A study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Final Report, OE-6-10-059. Columbia University, New York City, 1968.

Lenneberg, E. Biological foundations of language. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Lambert, W. A social psychology of bilingualism. In J. Macnamara (ed.), Problems of bilingualism. Journal of Social Issues, 1967, 23, Pt. 2, 91-109.

McKay, June Rumery. A partial analysis of a variety of nonstandard Negro English. University of California, Berkeley, Ph.D. dissertation, 1969.

Osser, H., Wang, M., and Zaid, F. The young child's ability to imitate and comprehend speech: A comparison of two subcultural groups. Child Development, in press.

Rainey, Mary. Style-switching in a Headstart class. In Studies of Interaction, University of California, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Laboratory Working Paper No. 16, 1969.

Robinson, W.P. Social factors and language development in primary school children. In Renira Huxley and Elizabeth Ingram (eds.), Mechanisms in child language development, in press.

Shuy, R., Wolfram, W., and Riley, W.K. Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech, Final Report, OE-6-1347, 1967.

Slobin, D.I. (ed.). A field manual for cross-cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence. University of California, Berkeley, Associated Students' Bookstore, 1967.

Stern, Carolyn and Keislar, E. An experimental investigation of the use of dialect vs. standard English as a language of instruction. OEO Project No. IED 66-1-12.

Stewart, W. Toward a history of American Negro dialect. In F. Williams (ed.), Language and poverty, in press.

Torrey, Jane. Teaching standard English to speakers of other dialects. Second International Congress of Applied Linguistics, Cambridge, England, 1969.

Triandis, H.D., Loh, W.D., and Levin, Leslie. Race, status, quality of spoken English, and opinions about civil rights as determinants of interpersonal attitudes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3, 468-472.

Tucker, R., and Lambert, W. White and Negro listeners' reactions to various American-English dialects. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meeting, 1967.

Waterhouse, J. Report on a Neighborhood Youth Corps Summer Language Program, July 1 - August 2, 1968. University of California, Berkeley (mimeo).

Weener, P.D. Social dialect differences and the recall of verbal messages. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1969, 60, 194-199.

Blount, B.G. Acquisition of language by Luo children. University of California, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Laboratory Working Paper No. 19. (Ph.D. Dissertation), 1969.

Brown, R., Cazden, C.B., and Bellugi, U. The child's grammar from I to III. In J.P. Hill (ed.), Minnesota Symposium for Child Psychology. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1969.

Cazden, Courtney. The neglected situation in child language research and education. In F. Williams (ed.), Language and Poverty, Perspectives on a Theme. Chicago: Markham, 1970.

Coulthard, R.M. and Robinson, W.P. The structure of the nominal group and elaborateness of code. Language and Speech, 1968, 11, 234-250.

Cowan, P. The link between cognitive structure and social structure in two-child verbal interaction. Symposium presented at the Society for Reserarch on Child Development meeting, 1967.

Edelman, M. The contextualization of schoolchildren's bilingualism. In Joshua Fishman, Robert L. Cooper, Roxana Ma, et al. Bilingualism in the barrio. Final Report, 1968, Yeshiva University, Contract No. OEC-1-7-062817-0297, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 525-537.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. Sociolinguistics. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, vol. 4, New York: Academic Press, 91-165.

-----. An analysis of the interaction of language, topic, and listener. In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes, Directions in sociolinguistics, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, in press, 86-102.

Fischer, J.L. Social influences in the choice of a linguistic variant. Word, 1958, 14, 47-56.

Geohegan, W. The use of marking rules in semantic systems. University of California, Berkeley: Language-Behavior Laboratory Working Paper No. 26, 1969.

Gumperz, J.J. and Hymes, D. The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, Pt. 2, No. 6.

-----. Directions in sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, in press.

Gumperz, J.J. Cognitive aspects of bilingual communication. Unpublished manuscript, 1968.

-----. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities: In J.J. Gumperz and D. Hymes (eds.), The ethnography of communication. American Anthropologist, 1964, 66, Pt. 2, No. 6.

Williams, F. Psychological correlates of speech characteristics: On sounding disadvantaged. Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, in press.

----- and Naremore, Rita C. On the functional analysis of social class differences in modes of speech. Speech Monographs, 1969, 36, No. 2, 77-101.

Wolfram, W. A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech. Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

Response to "Social Dialects in Developmental Sociolinguistics"

Claudia Mitchell Kernan
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

The notion of communicative competence provides a much needed frame of reference for examining language development. It relates language development to a community of speakers of a language and to the intricacies of acquiring native speaker competence in any language, i.e. the social rules for language use. From this perspective, interpreting the language behavior of any group becomes problematic. The absence of such a frame of reference makes the results of much comparative work on children from different social groups irrelevant, at best. This brings us to one of the most important issues raised by Dr. Tripp, concerning the failure to deal meaningfully with the testing of culturally different populations. It is important enough to bear reemphasis.

Many misconceptions concerning the abilities and development of culturally different children have originated in culturally and linguistically biased research. Many such findings have been incorporated into teachers' mythology about their pupils producing an atomosphere of low expectation and a rationale for academic failure. What is highly relevant is the damage done by some of this research which has obfuscated rather than clarified issues.

The findings summarized here underscore Dr. Tripp's point that we cannot assume the validity of tests which attempt to assess abilities and competencies across dialect and social boundaries.

Errors in interpretation have been so gross as to equate the absence of a Standard English device for expressing some grammatical meaning, such as possession, with the absence of that concept or the absence of grammatical means for expressing it. Some findings indicate that our "non-verbal" child may become highly verbal in response to a shift in interlocutor or topic. Inability to elaborate verbally disappears when efforts are made to be explicit in orienting subjects

to tasks. Some children will not elaborate verbally, however, when they define the task as information communication. They will not seize the opportunity to demonstrate fluency as children from other social groups might.

There is much lip service paid to the problem of cultural bias in testing in the literature. It is my impression, that cultural bias is for the most part viewed as introducing relatively minor error into analysis, in much the same way that a statistician might view the imprecision which results from rounding procedures. Sociolinguistic research does indeed point to new avenues of approach which promise to reduce some aspects of this bias. Dr. Tripp's suggestion that attempts be made to orient tests directly to the speech community that is being tested and that validation take place within this context is important in this connection.

I would like to add further that we need to develop a far more problematic attitude toward interpreting tests and the results of our research. Even where there is no disjunction between the cultural background implicitly assumed in a test and that of the subjects, many of the tests can hardly be thought of as instruments of precision in terms of what they purport to measure. In terms of the interpretations and inferences drawn from rather crude instruments, including ill-conceived research designs, one would think that the instruments being utilized were thermometers and ampmeters! Yet the practice of translating test results into intelligence quotients, level of cognitive development and level of linguistic development persists. "Level" is important here because there seems to be a predilection for talking about the differences these tests reveal in some hierarchical way. Sociolinguistic findings ought to suggest that much of which passes as measurement of ability and development is basically in need of rethinking.

Social dialect is being viewed as the source of a variety of ills. It has been linked to failure to acquire reading skills and inability to conceptualize logically. The latter view apparently deriving from the notion that a social dialect is inadequate structurally and more recently functionally as a medium of communication

in academic endeavors. Social dialects are thought to be a problem source in that they create intelligibility problems, problems which may stem from sociolinguistic as well as purely linguistic factors.

The basic confusion which occurs in some writings, concerning the relationship between language and logic is dealt with in depth by Labov (The Logic of Non-standard Negro English). The notion that the structure of a language disposes its speakers to illogical modes of expression and conceptualization is again refuted. Dr. Tripp notes that there is little evidence which would support the view that a child's dialect of English presents serious problems for his learning to understand written language. A single orthographic system supports a variety of spoken dialects of English and nowhere is the spoken language precisely represented by the orthography. This issue is in need of resolution nevertheless, because it is being used as an explanation for reading failure. Social dialect is probably not so directly a source of academic failure as we are prone to assume. We might envision, for example, what might happen if reading readiness is judged by phonological indices which are derived from a speech community other than that of the child tested.

We cannot hope to resolve problems which are so vague and poorly defined. In addition, we cannot hope to develop a sense of priority in research without addressing ourselves to these issues.

The entire issue of teaching Standard English to speakers of social dialects is in need of meaningful rationales if new approaches are to be developed. We can also hope to gain by greater specificity in defining what it is we mean by Standard English. We need to abandon vague references to network English and the language of major affairs. There is hardly a case to be made for the homogeneity of this language. Should control of a defined standard be a goal in writing or in speaking? A competence in a written standard may be a far more important feedback system to a spoken language than any amount of patterned practice. Moreover, the correction of written language might circumvent the creation of inhibitory responses in children.

There is the implicit assumption in much of our research that the school is a culture contact situation. Our task seems to be defined as the successful interpretation of the culture and behavior of the "problem" target group to the socializing agents of the school. This is a rather one-sided approach to a contact situation. The unknown quantity is thought to be the target group and little if any attention is paid to understanding the culture and social structure of the school. We understand the school only in terms of highly codified beliefs and values which underlie and rationalize formal education. I would like to see research conducted which focused on the classroom as a social situation and here again sociolinguistic methods have a great deal to contribute. We might for example adopt sociolinguistic methodology in an effort to understand the additional roles and identities the major actors bring to this arena. This kind of focus could provide some much needed insight into how in the context of the school academic growth becomes subordinated to other ends.

In the case of the black community, ethnographic data accumulating on black folk culture has made attractive the possibility of incorporating parts of this culture into the school curriculum. We are witnessing the development of dialect readers, some of which bear little relation to the dialect as it is spoken and which fail to maintain linguistic distinctions which are intra-culturally meaningful. Many differences between English as it is spoken in black communities and non-black communities can not be represented as categorical rules. Rules for the selection of contrasting variants have not been specified in detail. In some cases they relate to intra-culturally meaningful definitions of appropriateness with regard to social situation, interlocutor, etc. Linguistically defined black variants occur side by side with their standard English referential equivalents. It has become patently clear that the linguistic view of black language is removed from the native speaker view. The incorporation of aspects of black folk culture into the schools cannot and must not proceed without opening up communication between the school and the community. The success of any such venture rests upon the ability of the school to adequately communicate its intention to the community.

Reaction in the black community to black English as it is portrayed in some grammars and readers seems to be interpreted by many social scientists as a further manifestation of the group's negative self-image. From this perspective the attitude of the black community is seen as a self-inflicted source of complication to otherwise reasonable remedies. As mentioned above, many representations of black English differ to such a degree from the language as it is presently used that they ought to presage the reaction. The search for a new identity underway in black communities everywhere and the spirit of rebellion against an identity defined by outsiders should be adequate forewarnings to efforts to define and institutionalize a black language by non-blacks.

Lack of intelligibility between English dialects is not a matter of linguistic facts alone; it involves the attitudes of speaker-hearers. In fact intelligibility itself may be a sensitive index of attitude.

This "problem" dialectal heterogeneity between pupil and teacher and pupil and pupil could become an important resource and point of departure for creative language arts programs rather than a barrier to academic success.

Developmental Studies of Communicative Competence

Harry Osser
University of California
Berkeley, California

Research Assumptions

Psychologists have begun to reexamine their beliefs about the language skills of lower-class children and particularly those who speak a nonstandard dialect. One reason for this is that scholars have become aware of the various problems involved in extracting valid information from comparative studies of the languages of children from different subcultural backgrounds. We are nowadays less eager to interpret the consistent discovery in such studies of differences favoring the middle-class group as evidence of deficiencies of the lower-class group. We are beginning to be concerned with the meaning of these differences.

What do these differences represent? One possibility is that they simply reflect bias in the experimental procedures which disfavors the lower-class group. (The term "lower-class group" will be used to include nonstandard speakers from now on.) There are three possible sources of procedural bias: (a) in the collection of language data, (b) in the analysis of language data, and (c) in the interpretation of language data.

Bias in the collection of language data can occur if speech samples are obtained in situations that are alien to one of the experimental groups. A topic of conversation may elicit a flood of speech from the members of one subcultural group and virtual silence from the children who make up the other subcultural group. If this occurs in many communicative contexts, then the latter group's linguistic competence, i.e. knowledge of the formal properties of their language, will be underestimated. Similarly, unless a subcultural group is placed in familiar communication situations so that it can demonstrate how and under what conditions language functions for them, then their communicative competence will most certainly be underestimated.

Bias can occur in the analysis of language data, for example, if speech samples obtained from both Negro and white groups were searched for the presence of standard linguistic forms only. Similarly, bias can exist at the level of interpretation of the data, as Baratz (1969) has pointed out. She argues that data obtained by testing Negro children on Standard English material tell us about their ability in that dialect but do not tell us about their general language ability.

The relatively poor performance of lower-class children on experimental language tasks is, at least in part, a reflection of procedural bias. However, in the analysis of such bias we have become aware that there may be some relationships between specific speech functions and social class membership. These relationships have educational implications. For example, there may be differences, and even interference, between the lower-class child's use of speech outside of the classroom and the speech function requirements of the school (Hymes, in press).

In order to aid children to acquire more effective communication skills, we will be obliged to learn how speech functions for them, so that we may add other functions to their repertoires. A number of experiments on communication in children will now be examined: they are concerned with the analysis of the abilities necessary for successful communication. Collectively, these experiments provide an initial model for the study of some aspects of children's communicative competence.

Research Review

1. Developmental Studies of Communicative Competence. Piaget and Inhelder (1956) studied the development of one kind of role playing in children from 4 to 11 years of age. They faced a scale model of three mountains and were tested for their ability to represent the appearance of the mountains from positions other than their own. In one test, the child was asked to select from a series of photographs the one which depicted what the mountains looked like to a doll sitting on the opposite side of the mountains from the child. The youngest

children persistently chose their own viewpoint; however, at the middle of the age range tested, the children were able to represent to themselves the other's perspective. In an earlier study, Piaget (1926) had investigated the verbal communication skills of children from 6 to 8 years old. His procedure was to tell a story to a child who then told it to another child who in turn told it to the experimenter. Piaget found that the younger children used speech egocentrically; that is, they appeared to talk to themselves rather than taking the listener into consideration. By 7 to 8 years of age, genuine socially communicative speech occurred.

These two studies provided both a theoretical and experimental point of departure for a program of research on the development of role taking and communication behavior carried out by Flavell, Botkin, Fry, Wright, and Jarvis (1968). In their elaboration of Piagetian theory, they propose that communication is achieved through the point operation of at least two social-cognitive activities. These are: (a) role taking, where the speaker attempts to deduce the listener's role characteristics and (b) verbal communication, where the speaker sends a message that is adapted to the listener's role attributes. Flavell et al., interpret effective communication as involving an editing process where the speaker codes a message for himself and then recodes it for the listener. This interpretation is derived directly from Vygotsky's (1962) view of the child's development from private to social speech usage.

Flavell et al., argue that the speaker's discrimination of the role-attributes of the listener is not a sufficient condition for the construction of an effective message; other skills are involved. If a speaker's cognitive ability is inadequate, he cannot code a message for himself; further, an effective verbal message presupposes a set of well-developed verbal skills. Finally, the listener might lack the necessary decoding skills to make the message successful. To summarize this theory, if the speaker fails to analyze the role characteristics of the listener, then the latter becomes a relatively unimportant cognitive object for the speaker and the message is no more than an

audible self-coding. If, on the other hand, the speaker does attend to the individual characteristics of the listener, then they will function continuously to monitor the content of the message.

Flavell et al., carried out a number of studies to test this theory. They designed a series of communication tasks which evaluate the child's ability to "take on" the role attributes of others for the purpose of producing an effective verbal message. Several of these tasks will now be presented.

Task 1A appears to tap the explanatory speech function. Children from grades 2-11 were instructed to communicate information about the rules and materials of a specially devised game to (a) a blindfolded experimenter who had to rely solely on verbal information and (b) a sighted experimenter who was able to supplement the child's verbal description by looking at the game materials as the child was speaking. The experimental hypothesis was that the older children would be more sensitive to the different input needs of the two experimenters, giving the "blind" experimenter more verbal information. The results indicated support for the hypothesis that the older the child, the more likely was he to alter his communicative strategy when he talked to the "blind" experimenter and in doing so provided more information to him than to the "seeing" experimenter.

Task 2A involves the child's retelling a story (so evidently assesses narrative ability) -- The Fox and the Grapes -- to (a) a life-sized photograph of a man and (b) a life-sized photograph of a 4-year old. The children were from grades 3, 7, and 11. The hypothesis was that the younger speakers would be less likely to alter the story for the 4-year-old "listener" than would the older children. The children's verbalizations were scored for the number of simplifying recodings (i.e. substitutions, additions, and deletions) that would make the story more comprehensible for the young "listener." The results supported the hypothesis; there was a significant increase in recoding activity between grades 3 and 7. Only a quarter of the third graders altered the story even minimally for the young listener, whereas almost all of the older children did. Flavell et al., suggest that the third graders

typically functioned as if the storytelling situation was dyadic rather than triadic, that is, as if they were concerned with the story alone, rather than with the story and the audience.

Flavell et al., carried out a small number of training experiments to attempt some modification of communicative behavior. In one study, Jarvis examined the child's ability to profit from immediate feedback on the effectiveness of his message. The children were from grades 2, 6, and 9. Each child was asked to describe a pictorial design composed of four geometric figures so that a listener sitting on the other side of a screen could draw it. The experimenter commented on the supposedly poor quality of the drawing and asked the speaker to repeat the description so that the listener could make an exact copy of the design. The hypothesis was that the older children would improve their message quality more than the younger children. The scoring system used was based on the information categories of color, size, shape, and position. The mean scores for each message showed the expected increases as a function of age, particularly between grades 2 and 6. The second graders showed only a small amount of improvement between their pre- and post-feedback scores.

An analysis of the specific information communicated by each group in the post-feedback condition indicated that the two older groups had improved their scores in all categories, whereas the youngest group showed only small gains in their shape and color scores and even smaller gains in the size and position categories. Flavell et al., reject the possibility that the youngest children's failures were attributable to linguistic problems, arguing that the necessary vocabulary was available to them. It appears that the youngest children's communicative inadequacy was a function of two interrelated factors: (a) their inability to use their vocabulary on a particular task and (b) their inability to analyze the listener's role characteristics.

2. Social Class Factors in the Development of Communicative Competence. Although Flavell et al., did not concern themselves with the role of social class factors in the development of verbal communication skills, their studies do intersect with recent developments in sociolinguistic theory and research. For example, Bernstein (in press)

has discussed the topic of differences in communication styles within family types. He contrasts two kinds of families: (a) positional and (b) person-oriented which are differentiated with respect to their modes of social control. When appeals are made to the child in a positional family, they refer to his formal status ("Boys don't cry."); whereas appeals made to the child in a person-oriented family focus upon his individual characteristics ("I know you won't cry because you know it will upset grandma."). The training in interpersonal behavior is obviously quite different in these two family types.

Taking the information on the components of verbal communication provided by Flavell et al., together with Bernstein's description of the differences in child-rearing practices of the positional and the person-oriented family types, it becomes possible to hypothesize that children raised in person-oriented homes will perform better than those raised in positional homes on verbal communication tasks, at least of the kind used by Flavell et al. The assumption here is that role-attribute analysis is an important aspect of verbal communication and that person-oriented families train children to respond to the intent of the speaker/listener by analyzing his unique features, whereas positional families train their children to respond to the fixed-status features of the speaker/listener, which requires a confined rather than a detailed role attribute analysis. If person-oriented families are roughly equated to middle-class families and positional to lower class, then there is some evidence to support the hypothesis.

Williams and Naremore (1969) compared language samples obtained from lower and middle-class children in grades 5 and 6. One of their findings was that the lower-class child had a tendency to talk in the first peson communicating from his own perspective, thus using a self-focused mode of discourse. The middle-class child, by contrast, tended to employ a variety of perspectives in his remarks. The interrelations between linguistic structure and function is made salient by Williams and Naremore's observation that the middle-class child used the third person more frequently than the lower-class child, which increased his options in constructing subject noun phrases, so that he could incorporate many communication perspectives in one message.

In some related research, Hawkins (in press) examined samples of speech from 5-year-old middle- and lower-class children. He found that the middle-class children tended to use the noun and its associated forms, whereas the lower-class children made much greater use of the pronoun. The child who elects to use nouns has access to great flexibility in modification. He can produce, for example, "these two very long railroad trains," whereas modification is very limited for pronouns. This result suggests that middle-class children open up possibilities of linguistic expansion by using nouns; whereas for those lower-class children who use pronouns, opportunities are very much more restricted. Hawkins also discovered that lower-class children, when describing a picture, tended to use exophoric pronouns, i.e. those that refer outward to the situational context. A child describing a picture might say, "They're playing and he kicks it." Here is a case where the speaker seems to assume that the listener can see the picture. It is certain that the listener cannot understand what is being referred to without seeing the picture. The speaker's language is not person-oriented. The middle-class child, however, tends to use anaphoric pronouns, i.e. those that refer to previously mentioned nouns. For example, "The boy kicked the ball and it broke the window." There is no strain on the listener here.

In another experiment, Osser and Harvey (1969) have analyzed samples of speech obtained from lower- and middle-class pre-schoolers. The speech was elicited by asking the child: (a) to describe some pictures, (b) to talk about events that occur during a typical day, and (c) to explain the rules of a few common children's games. One focus of the study is on various categories of hesitation phenomena. One such category seems to be particularly interesting, namely, "self-corrections." Some examples of self-corrections are: (a) She has/He has...; (b) He's wearing a hat/I mean...; (c) It's a dog/No it's a horse. The middle-class children emitted a larger number of these self-corrections than the lower-class children did.

There are many types of self-correction which may function quite differently from each other. For example, They was/They were implies knowledge of a standard grammatical rule, whereas the three examples

offered above may reflect knowledge of particular sociolinguistic rules ("Make your verbal message as explicit as possible."). It would be important to know what is the communicative role of self-corrections. Do they refer to the child setting certain minimal requirements for self-coding? Or is he setting requirements for his verbal coding to a listener? The child, of course, may be doing both.

Another part of the analysis suggests that social class related differences in self-correction may be contingent upon differences in self-coding. Analysis of the children's responses to the "games" questions (e.g. "Tell me how you play Hide and Seek?") in terms of the effectiveness of the communication indicated that a listener given information provided by a middle-class child on a particular game usually could play it. The lower-class child's explanations of the rules were usually verbally inadequate.

There are a number of possible interpretations of this finding, one being that the lower-class children did not linguistically self-code the game rules, so could not explicate them verbally for a listener. If this is a valid interpretation, then the fact that these children could play the games has to be explained. One possibility is that they acquired the game-skills simply by watching how a particular game is played.

3. An Interpretation of Social Class Differences in Communicative Competence. The experiments of Hawkins; Williams and Naremore; and Osser and Harvey provide some evidence on the existence of social class related differences in communicative competence. However, we have to be very wary of developing a mythology about differences in communicative competence considering the very limited empirical data available. It may be, as Hymes (mss.) suggests, that lower-class children may excel middle-class children in some aspects of communicative competence not yet observed or measured. However, some differences favoring middle-class children have been found and their meaning has to be explored. A good beginning point is to examine what a child has to learn in order to develop communicative competence. He must acquire several rule-systems, including: (a) the formal linguistic rules of his dialect;

(b) the sociolinguistic rules of his cultural group; and (c) social-cognitive rules, such as what kind of analysis of the listener's characteristics should be undertaken. These latter rules are not usually considered in discussions of the nature of communicative competence, but the research of Piaget; Piaget and Inhelder; and Flavell et al., offers convincing evidence that they should be included.

Differences in communicative competence across social class groups probably reflect differences in their rule-systems. For example, different interpretive rules may be brought to bear on the "same" communicative situation so that differences may be observed in the performance of lower- and middle-class groups even though, from their separate viewpoints, both have met the specific communicative demands of the situation. The results of the experiments of Hawkins; Williams and Naremore; and Osser and Harvey indicate the lower-class children are less "explicit" in their verbal communication than middle-class children are. We do not know whether lower-class children characteristically employ an "implicit" style of speech, as the range of situations where their speech has been sampled is very narrow. It is clear enough, however, that any child may be handicapped if he uses an implicit style in a classroom and in other social situations.

If may be the case that we will want to broaden the communicative competence of lower-class children if research continues to turn up evidence that they lack certain communicative skills that are prerequisite for academic success. We might aim at adding some sociolinguistic rules and some social-cognitive rules to the child's repertoires.A major problem here would derive from the interference between the new rules and the child's well-established communicative rule-systems (see Hymes, mss. for a detailed discussion of this problem).

Research Suggestions

It would be educationally profitable to undertake further research on the various rule-systems that support communicative competence in children from those subcultural groups which contribute disproportionately

to the total number of academic failures, viz., Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and poor whites. For example, we need to find out under what conditions children use language and for what purposes. Similarly, we need information on the many roles of language in the classroom. A beginning has been made in classroom verbal interaction analysis--Bellack et al. (1966) have examined the conversations of teachers and students (10th-12th graders) while a unit of social studies was being taught. Bellack et al., viewed the conversations as verbal games with particular rules and structure. They analyzed the speech samples into four major categories of verbal interaction:

1. Structuring: Teacher's initial discussion of topic.
2. Soliciting: Eliciting speech by questions, requests, etc.
3. Responding: Reciprocal verbal moves to soliciting.
4. Reacting: Functions to modify by clarifying, synthesizing, or expanding.

Within each of these categories different types of meaning are communicated:

1. Substantive meaning: Subject matter of class-specific concepts and generalizations.
2. Substantive-logical meaning: Refers to cognitive processes involved in dealing with the subject matter, such as defining, interpreting, explaining, fact stating, opining, and justifying.
3. Instructional meanings: Routine classroom procedures.
4. Instructional logical meaning: Distinctly didactic verbal processes such as those involved in rating, explaining procedures, and giving directions.

Bellack et al., provide a good start to the task of classroom verbal analysis (see, also, Amidon & Hunter, 1966). However, it will be necessary to go much beyond what they have accomplished in order to develop effective intervention procedures. We need to know, for example, how language functions for children of different ages (particularly during the kindergarten and early grade school years) and from different subcultural backgrounds in various educational contexts, e.g. learning arithmetic, learning to read, learning elementary science, etc. With such information, and other information on the children's use of language

outside of school (i.e. knowledge of the rules that underlie their communicative competence), we could begin to delineate areas of interference and hopefully develop procedures for enlarging children's communicative competence, if this was discovered to be necessary.

References

Amidon, E., and Hunter, Elizabeth. Improving teaching: The analysis of classroom verbal interaction. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1966.

Baratz, Joan C. A bi-dialectal task for determining language proficiency in economically disadvantaged Negro children. Child Development, 1969, 40, 889-901.

Bellack, A.A., Dliebard, H.M., Hyman, R.T., Smith, F.L., Jr. The language of the classroom. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1966.

Bernstein, B. A sociolinguistic approach to socialization: With some reference to educability. In Directions in Sociolinguistics (Eds. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston (in press).

Flavell, J.H., et al. The development of role-taking and communication skills in children. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Hawkins, P.R. Social class, the nominal group and reference. Language and Speech (in press).

Hymes, D. "On communicative competence" (mss.).

Osser, H. and Harvey, Karen. Organizational properties of children's speech (in preparation).

Piaget, J. and Inhelder, Barbel. The child's conception of space. London: Routledge, Kegan & Paul, 1956.

Piaget, J. The language and thought of the child. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1926.

Vygotsky, L.S. Thought and language. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1962.

Williams, F. and Naremore, Rita C. On the functional analysis of social class differences in modes of speech. Speech Monographs, 1969, 36, 77-102.

Response to "Developmental Studies of Communicative Competence"

Vera John
Yeshiva University
New York, New York

I would like to address myself to the question of the relevance of psychological approaches to the study of dialect. I have a long-standing interest in examining the functions of speech--witness our work on spontaneous speech in the late fifties (Soskin, W. and John, V., "The Study of Spontaneous Talk.") Osser's paper on communication studies is of great interest to me, precisely because I find this area so promising. But, I have to raise a more basic question. Are psychologists equipped to deal with the study of dialects? I doubt it.

The framework of experimental psychology prepares us to take an extremely narrow point of view. If we take seriously the position that we are dealing, in the study of dialect, with culturally patterned differences, not deficiencies, then the experimental framework of pre- and post-testing, and experimental and control groups (these are our methodological bags of tricks) becomes a handicap. This is a powerful framework when the experimental variables are pure. But when variables have not been isolated, this kind of a framework breeds pre-mature and often faulty work.

Psychologists who have done some of the early research on sub-cultural differences in patterns of language tended to be committed and responsible human beings. They were dismayed by the lack of interest on the part of most of their colleagues in research projects of social relevance. However, this concern for the educational problems of the ghetto child did not protect us from theoretical and methodological pitfalls.

When one looks at culturally patterned differences, one has to start with description. This intricate, slow and painful process, requiring field research, is recommended by Osser. But in so much of the extant

psychological research differences have been hypothesized without this necessary and previous stage of careful, ethnological and linguistic description. And therefore, a situation has been created where speech functions have been looked at, and spoken of, as definite, crystalized traits of children, instead of as widely varying capabilities and skills which are displayed in varying forms and functions in discrete settings. This stems from a deep bias on the part of psychologists toward a methodology in which comparative and correlational approach is always preferred to a descriptive one. I submit that this has to stop. We need a more careful, ethnological research of the sort presented by Claudia Mitchell Kernan (see pp. 75-79).

Psychologists can have an impact upon the life and educational development of speakers of dialect, but in a different way than we have thought of to date. The field of comparative research of the language proficiency and language functions of children drawn from diverse groups is a dead-end for psychologists, particularly those working within a traditional experimental framework, and in isolation from the insights of native speakers of social dialects, linguists and anthropologists. In a brilliant and accusing article William Labov has pointed out the destructive role played by the educational psychologist in contemporary American society. (Labov, W., "The Logic of Non-Standard English"). On the other hand, there are two areas in which psychologists may make useful contributions to speakers of dialect. These are: human learning and socialization.

Some questions raised in recent days pertain to the former of these fields. The phenomenon of linguistic interference is one example. What are interference effects when two language forms are very similar and there are no clear markers to help the child decide which of the forms is applicable? The laboratory methods of studying human learning, together with sociolinguistic information, may help to find an answer to such a question.

I would hate to repudiate everything about our early research in the area of sub-cultural differences and language proficiency. Personally, I am still fascinated with questions related to language and

thought, and language and learning. However, the question of how language is used by the child-speaker of dialect, who inevitably is also a member of a poverty group in this society, may not be answerable by researchers with their current biases and ignorance of the community in which that child was raised. We have been told by many Black social scientists that they are tired of being studied. Indians, too, are now echoing that same plea. The value of research which depends upon the full and equal participation of, and which incorporates the culturally specific insights of the Indian, Black or other Third-World social scientist is illustrated by the work of Dumont. He described the role of silence in some Sioux and Cherokee classrooms. The intricate non-verbal struggle taking place between teacher and students in these classrooms cannot be effectively quantified, or even described, without an understanding of how these children are opposing their present education. To understand what the mechanisms are in this struggle, we must first recognize that these children have been defeated in schools as young learners. They have few alternatives. They can take over the classrooms, in their terms; and their terms are to frustrate the teacher in any further attempt to impose upon their psyches. And they do so in a characteristically silent manner. The manner in which this classroom struggle is conducted is very complex to the observer unless he is familiar with some of the cultural forms of interaction of the Sioux and the Cherokee. At the beginning, even to an Indian anthropologist making casual observations, it appears as if nothing is happening. After a while, this picture changes.

We have to be willing to admit, on the one hand, very humbly as psychologists, that we charged into areas without adequate interdisciplinary efforts that might have helped to achieve an insight into what we wanted to study; and therefore, we should slow down, stop and then, redirect our efforts (I feel that national testing efforts fall into this category of mistaken research). On the other hand, we ought to direct some efforts into broader questions of human learning that are relevant to the education of all children.

What do I mean by this? Science requires extensive research with many false starts. Laymen and scientists accept that vision of science in a field such as cancer research. But, in a socially explosive situation, the mistakes of an early stage of research are usually contained in the very problem that gave rise to the research. There is an additional price paid by mistaken leads and faulty approaches in social situations: the problem being studied is usually aggravated by the research mistakes.

Hess has asked us to separate scientific considerations from considerations of value (pp. 38-41). I am not sure that this is possible. Often, the very way in which we ask questions is based upon untested assumptions; and once the question has been asked, and the research completed, we have added one more burden to the life of the dialect speaker. This is exactly what some of our Black colleagues are telling us throughout the country at professional meetings. "You act like you did not know why you are asking certain questions; but there are reasons why you ask them, and reasons for the way you have asked them. Perhaps, that is what you should think of first, before you do any more research."

One of the things we might do, if we are interested in research with social implications, is to look at the middle-class. If we are going to ask rather complex questions, such as, what is the role of socialization in language and cognitive development (questions Bernstein has asked, and others have investigated) we ought to start where we do have some intuitive knowledge. Because psychology has addressed itself primarily, for the last 40 years, to the learning processes of the lower mammal, we have relatively little theory or facts to offer in the complex areas we have talked about, such as the relationship of dialect to abstract thinking. (Witness the observations of Bereiter.) So we charge into an area of maximum complexity--because we want to be useful--an area of maximum theoretical complexity, into situations such as the ghettoes and reservations, communities about which social scientists know very little, and can know very little, especially at a time, as Cazden has observed, when social change in the ghetto is greatly accelerated. (In the Roxbury ghetto, for example, researchers

anticipated different results in attitudes toward instruction in dialect in the same neighborhood on two different streets based on the particular political developments on each block.)

Thus, let us do more fundamental research on the relationship between language and intellectual endeavor in social groups where we have both familiarity and some intuitive knowledge.

The broad theoretical questions of language and its uses are still with us. But I wish that we would withdraw for the time being from comparative research, for we have not yet come up with any basic answers in social settings about which we do have some knowledge and familiarity.

Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective: Assumptions, Current Research, and Future Directions

Walt Wolfram
Center for Applied Linguistics
Washington, D.C.

I. Assumptions

The investigation of language in relation to social class is essentially based on two sets of assumptions, one dealing with the cognitive and one with the behavioral function of language. The assumptions concerning the cognitive function of language, language as CODE, deal with the communicative capacity of the form of language as a system of signs. The assumptions relevant to the behavioral function of language, language as BEHAVIOR, deal with the role of language as one aspect of cultural behavior through which societal roles are carried out. The first set of assumptions are generally considered within the proper limit of descriptive linguistics as it has traditionally been defined, but the second set of assumptions are considered only when the broader context of language in society is included. It is for this reason that the assumptions dealing with language as code are well-known by even elementary linguistic students--they are part of most introductory courses in descriptive linguistics. The second set, however, are not as obvious to linguists, but appear to be essential for the investigation of social dialects. Of course, there is an essential interrelationship between these two sets of assumptions, so that the separation of them in our discussion may be one of convenience more than theoretical justification.

Language as Code

The research assumptions of linguistics in relation to the study of language differences are derived from the anthropological tradition of cultural relativism[1]. When anthropologists at the turn of the century reacted to the evaluative measures of their predecessors in describing non-western cultures, they set the stage for a similar view of language differences. American anthropologists such as Boas, Kroeber, and

Herskovitz insisted on viewing cultures descriptively rather than by some yardstick of evolutionary development. Such an approach precluded classifying a language as "underdeveloped", "primitive" or inherently inferior simply because it was used in a culture devoid of the technological implements found in western civilization: the notion of "primitive" languages was denounced as a product of ethnocentrism by socially and technologically superordinate cultures.

Descriptive linguists, then, simply adopted the same assumptions about language that anthropologists had maintained for non-linguistic aspects of cultural behavior. Even as anthropologists rejected the Procrustean mold of western civilization in describing other cultures, linguistic descriptions rejected the mold of the classical languages in describing non-Indo-European languages. The opinion that languages have many different ways of expressing "underlying" logical operations became the cornerstone of assumptions about language differences. At first, these assumptions were relevant mainly to languages compared across clear-cut cultures; later they became relevant to the comparisons of speech differences for different social levels within the framework of a larger culture. It is within the latter framework that we shall discuss the basic linguistic assumptions concerning social dialects.

What then, is the explicit nature of these assumptions? In order to discuss these assumptions, we must begin with the primitive assumptions linguists accept in their definition of LANGUAGE.

One of the basic premises about the nature of language is that verbal systems are arbitrary, established only by convention.[2] Although one cannot deny a certain degree of consistency in the relation of language to the outside world, relationships between objects and linguistic signs are arbitrary. All languages adequately provide for the conceptualization and expressions of logical propositions, but the particular mode (i.e. grammar) for conceptualizing may differ drastically between language systems. The linguist, therefore, assumes that different surface forms for expression have nothing to do with the underlying logic of a sentence. There is nothing inherent in a given language variety which will interfere with the development of conceptualization.[3] This is not to say that differences between the

handling of logical operations may never correlate with different social classes; however, on the basis of this premise, it cannot be related to language differences, since all language varieties adequately provide for expression of syllogistic reasoning.

To those familiar with the current interest in nonstandard English, particularly Black English (the language variety spoken typically by lower-class blacks), it should be apparent that this assumption does not coincide with the conclusions of some of the current projects in the area. Yet, the work of Bereiter and Englemann (1965, 1966) proposes such a view. To suggest that Black English imposes certain cognitive limitations on the logical operations of Black English speakers and to reject it as "illogical" is not generally taken seriously by linguists. Ultimately, such notions seem to be derived from a prescriptive norm for language usage, although philosophical dictums about the logical nature of certain rules of a language add a ring of authority to such pronouncements.

To illustrate one of the most cited examples of the inherent logical foundation of Standard English, we can cite the use of negatives with indefinites. If a person uses a sentence such as John didn't do anything, it is understood negatively, but if a person should use the sentence, John didn't do nothing, it can only be meant as a positive statement since two negatives logically make a positive.[4] In this view, if a person uses the construction in a sentence such as John didn't do nothing because he was so lazy, he is using English in an illogical way. Therefore the sentence does not mean what the speaker thought it meant. The speaker apparently means that John did not work, but by saying John didn't do nothing he affirms that John actually did something. Interpretations of this sort ignore a quite regular rule in Black English (as well as in languages such as Spanish and Italian) which states that when you have a negative sentence with indefinites, you may add a negative element to every indefinite (e.g. We ain't never had no trouble about none of us pullin' out no knife or nothin'). In the underlying structure there is only one negative, which is simply realized on every indefinite.

Essential to understanding the underlying proposition of the above sentence is the distinction between "deep" and "surface" structure in

language[5]. Deep structure is basically a system of propositions that interrelate in such a way as to express the meaning of the sentence, while surface structure is realization of these propositions in terms of the particular grammatical devices (e.g. linear ordering, grammatical categories) of the language. The knowledge of language involves the ability to assign deep and surface structures to an infinite range of sentences, to relate these structures appropriately, and to assign a semantic interpretation and phonetic interpretation to the paired deep and surface structure. The failure to understand this relation is, no doubt, responsible for some of the misinterpretation of non-standard varieties of languages. We see, in the case of Black English multiple negation, that the basis for arguing for its supposed illogicality is found in the mistaken identity of a surface structure for a deep structure.

Proclamations about the inadequacy of Black English on logical bases, from a linguistic perspective, are attributed to a naive disregard for one of the primitive premises about the nature of language. Yet, Bereiter maintains that a difference between the negative patterns of Black English and Standard English is an indication that the black ghetto child is "deprived of one of the most powerful logical tools our language provides"(1965:199). Bereiter claims that a black ghetto child "does not know the word not" since his subjects did not regularly give him the form in negating a sentence such as This is not a book. The assumptions of Bereiter, however, reveal two misconceptions. In the first place, he has confused the inability of the student to give him the word not in a specific elicitation task with the child's unfamiliarity with the lexical item. Labov (1969b), observes that many of the formal elicitation procedures in the context of a classroom can be quite intimidating to the student and the best defense may be no verbal response at all. Intensive research on the structure of Black English in Washington, D.C. and Detroit clearly indicates that not is an integral part of Black English. Secondly, Bereiter is apparently unaware that the use of other negative patterns may serve the same purpose as not. Thus, a sentence such as This ain't no book

may communicate the same negative pattern as not although the structure of the sentence is different. What is essential is not the occurrence of a particular lexical item, or a specific syntactical pattern, but the realization of a particular type of underlying structure involving negation. Whatever deficiencies in logical operations may or may not exist among black ghetto children, these have nothing to do with language.[6]

A second assumption of the linguist is the adequacy of all languages or dialects as communicative systems. It is accepted as a given, that language is a human phenomenon which characterizes every social group, and that all language systems are perfectly adequate as communicative systems for the members of the social group. The social acceptability of a particular language variety is totally unrelated to its adequacy as a communicative code. The question concerning different language varieties is not the WHAT but the HOW of communication. Thus, the consideration of the so-called disadvantaged child as "nonverbal", "verbally destitute", or at best, "drastically deficient" in his speech is diametrically opposed to this basic assumption. That there are typical situations in which young children do not respond because of the uncomfortableness of the social situation, or as a protective device against middle class meddling, should not be interpreted as meaning that the child does not emphasize the importance of verbal manipulation.

As Labov (1969b) has vividly pointed out, monosyllabic responses in certain types of social situations involving a teacher and child might be an effective defense to a hostile and threatening situation. But if an indigenous social situation is set up, the same child who was judged as nonverbal on the basis of a formal test situation may be shown to be highly verbal and manipulative in his speech. Linguists assume that the label "verbal destitutions" cannot refer to vernacular language patterns in an indigenous setting, but to the impression of speech created by a non-indigenous social setting.

Some linguists, following Chomsky (1965), would assume the communicative adequacy of any language or language variety on the basis of an innate "universal" grammar (i.e. it is a putative attribute of being human). This innate language propensity involves the following properties, according to Chomsky (1965:30):

(i) a technique for representing input signals

(ii) a way of representing structural information about these signals

(iii) some initial delimitation of a class of possible hypotheses about language structure

(iv) a method for determining what each hypothesis implies with respect to each sentence

(v) a method for selecting one of the (presumably infinitely many) hypotheses that are allowed by (iii) and are compatible with the given primary linguistic data.

Other linguists, following the behavioralist tradition explicated by Skinner (1957), insist that the acquisition of language should be attributed to a stimulus-response relationship rather than an innate universal grammar. From this perspective, the adequacy of language systems would be claimed on the basis of cross-cultural comparisons. That is, the postulate about the communicative adequacy of languages is derived inductively, based on the empirical data from a representative sample of world languages. Both approaches, then, would make the same claim about the adequacy of language systems, although their reasoning for such a position might differ somewhat. Although both approaches arrive at the same conclusion with respect to this issue, there is one important implication which should be brought out. Chomsky's perspective assumes that any normal child will have the equipment to deal with the logical operations underlying language--it is an attribute of the human mind (see Chomsky 1968). But is possible, given the behavioralist perspective, that a particular type of environment might inhibit the acquisition of these logical properties necessary for an adequate language system.

The question of adequacy of nonstandard dialects as a communicative systems brings out a very important matter on how one views a nonstandard language variety. In actuality, the viewpoint is much broader than the linguistic situation, reverting back to the basic approach to different social groups. One can for example, view black ghetto culture and language in terms of two basic models, which Baratz (1968) has called deficit or difference models[7]. A deficit model treats speech differences in terms of a norm and deviation from that norm, the norm

being middle-class white behavior. From a sociological perspective, this means that much of black ghetto behavior, which differs from middle-class behavior, is viewed as deviant behavior -- a type of pathology. In terms of speech behavior, Black English is considered, in the words of Hurst (1965:2), "the pathology of non-organic speech deficiencies". On the other hand, a difference model, which seems to be much more common to anthropology than sociology and psychology, considers socially subordinate societies and language varieties as self-contained systems, inherently neither deficient nor superior. Language varieties are different but equal.

Although this dichotomy between a deficit and difference model may be somewhat oversimplified, it sets a helpful framework for considering theoretical approaches to nonstandard dialects. But there is also a practical importance in such a distinction. If, for example, one simply considers nonstandard dialects to be corrupt approximations of standard English, one may miss important structural facts about the nature of these dialects. For example, consider the following interpretation of the finite use of the form be, a commonly cited feature of Black English. Ruth Golden, who views Black English in terms of a descending scale of deviation from Standard English states:

> Individuals use different levels of language for different situations. These levels vary from the illiterate to the formal and literary. For instance, starting with the illiterate, He don't be here, we might progress to the colloquial, He ain't here, to the general and informal He isn't here up to the formal and literary, He is not present (1963:173).

From the perspective of a deficit model, be, is simply considered a corrupt approximation of Standard English. The possibility that be may have a grammatically different function is precluded. Instead, it is only considered as a "substitution" for the finite forms of Standard English am, is and are. The linguist as a structuralist, however, looks at this use of be descriptively; that is, he asks what the grammatical function of this form is. When such an approach is taken, we find that the form be represents a grammatical category which seems to be unique to Black English. This, of course, is not

to say that all linguists will accept a given descriptive analysis of this form (see Wolfram 1969:188-196) although a number of analyses agree that it is used to represent a habitual action of some type. This type of disagreement is no more serious than the disagreements that linguists may have over the function of the have auxiliary in Standard English. Common to each description of be, however, is the rigorous method of linguistic analysis, based on the assumption that this form has a linguistic function in its own right. The insistence on language varieties as systems in their own right (with both similarities and differences to related varieties) is the reason that linguists view suspiciously such terms as "substitutions", "replacements", "omissions", "deviations", etc. Such terms used with reference to nonstandard language varieties imply a value judgment about a given variety's relation to the standard variety. Terms like "correspondence" and "alternation" do not have these same implications -- they are statements of fact about language relations. While the terminology may seem to be a trivial matter for the linguist to pick on, the association of such terms with the deficit type of approach raises a danger signal to the linguist. To take the position that nonstandard constructions are simply inaccurate and unworthy approximations of Standard English can only lead to an inaccurate description of what is assumed by the linguist to be a self-contained system, which is perfectly adequate for communication.

Our previous point concerning the adequacy of nonstandard varieties of English as a system of communication naturally leads us to a further premise concerning language, namely, that is systematic and ordered. Any view of language differences which treats them as unsystematic and irregular will thus be categorically rejected by the linguist. It is assumed that descriptive data of related languages will always reveal regular and systematic correspondences between different types of constructions. One can readily see, then, why the linguist reacts negatively to a view of nonstandard language as that offered by Hurst, who subsumes differences between Black English and Standard English under the rubric "dialectolalia":

> ...dialectolalia involves such specific oral abberations as phonemic and subphonemic replacements, segmental phonemes, phonetic distortions, defective syntax, misarticulations, mispronunciations, limited or poor vocabulary, and faulty phonology. These variables exist most commonly in unsystematic, multi-farious combinations (1965:2).

Hurst's position unambiguously treats Black English as an irregular, unsystematic and faulty rather than a different but equal system. Furthermore, such a position can only be taken when actual descriptive and sociolinguistic facts are ignored, for the linguist would claim that all evidence points to differences between Standard English and Black English which are systematic and regular. Take, for example, the case of word-final consonant clusters in such words as test, ground, and cold. In Black English, the final consonant is absent more often than even the most colloquial forms of Standard English, the result of a systematic correspondence of a single consonant in Black English where a cluster is found in Standard English. Thus, we get something like tes', groun', and col' in Black English. But these final consonants are not absent randomly or unsystematically. We observe that the correspondence of a single consonant for a word-final cluster only occurs when both members of a potential cluster are either voiced or voiceless, such as st, nd, sk, and ld. But when one of the members is voiced and the other voiceless, as in the clusters mp (jump), lt (colt) and nt (count), this correspondence does not occur. Instead, Black English is like Standard English in that both members of the cluster are present. The view that differences between related language varieties are random and haphazard not only conflicts with a linguistic assumption, the view can be dangerous from a practical viewpoint. It can lead to an unsystematic approach in teaching Standard English and the teaching of points that may be irrelevant in terms of the systematic differences between the two language varieties.

As a final premise of the linguist, we must observe that language is learned in the context of the community. Linguists generally agree that children have a fairly complete language system by the age of 5 or 6, with minor adjustments in language competence occurring sometimes until 8 or 9. This system is acquired from contact with individuals in their environment. Whether this is primarily the

parent-child relationship (which some claim for the middle-class white community) or from child peers (which is sometimes claimed for the black ghetto community) a child's language is acquired through verbal interaction with individuals in the immediate context.

Whether one maintains that the child has the innate capacity to search for abstract grammatical rules from which sentences are generated (a la Chomsky) or one insists on a behavioralist perspective (a la Skinner), it is presumed that the child will have established an overall language competence by the age of 4-6. The rate of development is generally assumed to be parallel for children of different social groups (see Slobin 1967 for an actual investigation of this question), lower-class children learning the nonstandard dialect at approximately the same rate as middle-class children learning the standard variety of English. This assumption of the linguist concerning the rate of language development again comes into basic conflict with basic statements of educational psychologists such as Engelmann, Bereiter and Deutsch, who speak of the communal "language retardation" of ghetto children. Bereiter states:

> By the time they are five years old, disadvantaged children of almost every kind are typically one or two years retarded in language development. This is supported by virtually any index of language one cares to look at (1965:196).

Closer investigation of this claim reveals that these children are considered to be linguistically retarded, and, in many cases, to be cognitively deficient simply because they do not speak Standard English. Thus, if a black lower-class child says He nice, a correspondence of the present tense Standard English He's nice, it is considered to be an underdeveloped Standard English approximation and equivalent to the absence of copula at a particular stage of Standard English development (see, for example, Bereiter and Engelmann 1966:139-140). The fact that this form is used by adult speakers is irrelevant, only indicating the permanence of this retardation. The linguist, however, suggests that Black English is simply one of many languages, including Russian and Hungarian, which have a zero copula realization in the present tense. No meaning is lost; an "identity statement" is just as permissible in this language as any other language. This form has no relation to the ability or inability to conceptualize. Similarly, auditory

discrimination tests (such as Wepman's 1958) which are designed on a Standard English norm are de-facto dismissed by the linguist as biased against the nonstandard system. The learning of Standard English must be clearly differentiated from language development of an indigenous dialect. Careful attention should be made, from the viewpoint of linguistic relativism, in order not to erroneously transfer legitimate language or dialect differences into matters of language acquisition.

The linguist, in support of the linguistic equality of nonstandard dialects, considers evidence on relative language proficiency (as that recently provided by Baratz (1969)) to be an empirical justification for his claims. Baratz conducted a bi-dialectal test in which the proficiency of a group of black ghetto children in repeating Standard English and Black English sentences was compared. As might be expected, the black children were considerably more proficient in repeating the Black English sentences. When they repeated the Standard English sentences, however, there were predictable differences in their repetitions based on interference from Black English. The same test was then administered to a group of white middle-class suburban children, who repeated the Standard English sentences quite adequately, but had predictable differences in their repetition of the Black English sentences based on interference from Standard English. Which of these groups, then, was linguistically retarded? We must be careful not to confuse social acceptability, and no one would deny the social stigmatization of nonstandard dialects, with language acquisition.

In sum, the relativistic viewpoint of the linguist emphasizes the fully systematic but different nature of social dialects. All language varieties are efficient as communicative codes, and adequate for cognitive development. Inherent in the definition of LANGUAGE is the capability of expressing the logical propositions that are the basis of human thought.

Language as Behavior

In the previous section, we limited ourselves to linguistic assumptions which serve as the basis for the investigation of the cognitive function of language. But language must also be viewed in terms of its social function, language as behavior. And, when we view the role of

language in terms of its social function, the linguist (or more properly, the sociolinguist) also operates on the basis of some general assumptions about language in society. Although I shall describe these as assumptions, some of these observations more correctly might be considered hypotheses, given the current state of sociolinguistic research.

To begin with, it is axiomatic that language is one form of cultural behavior. If we assume that social differences in a culture will be manifested in non-linguistic behavioral patterns, then we may also expect that behavioral differences will be realized in language. Language differences presume social differences. Several anthropological linguists, particularly Hymes (1962, 1964, 1970) and Ervin-Tripp (1964, 1969) have explicated the numerous types of social factors which may effect linguistic differences, including setting (e.g. locale, situation), participants (e.g. sex, age, status), topic (e.g. religion, athletics, politics), and functions (e.g. requests, commands, rituals). Although we are primarily concerned with language differences which result from the differentiation of social positions in this discussion, the inter-relationship of social class with other social parameters is so intrinsic that it cannot be discussed completely apart from these.[3] It is the interaction of these various social parameters that is basic to the assumption that language differences result from social differences.

It should be noted that I have deliberately used the term result from in describing the relationship of linguistic and social differences, since I wish to imply that this relationship is one of cause and effect. Although the term correlation is often used to describe this relationship and may be accurate in terms of a particular descriptive model, it is not used here because of its neutrality with respect to cause and effect. Ultimately, the description of linguistic differences implies a cause and effect relationship between linguistic and social differences. Because of this relationship, it may be suggested that the description of linguistic differences is dependent upon an ethnographical description. Hymes observes:

> As the discovery of structure, sociolinguistics can be seen as an extension of usual linguistic description. The extension reaches a point, however, at which its dependence on social description becomes clear and inescapable. As description

> becomes sociolinguistic, it becomes partly ethnography, for the functions that underlie structure must be empirically determined. They can neither be taken for granted, nor merely postulated, and to determine them requires socio-cultural knowledge (1969:3)

Views on the extent to which ethnographical description must precede the description of language differences within a society vary greatly. For example, DeCamp (1968) first groups speakers solely on the basis of linguistic differences. Having grouped speakers on this basis, he then proceeds to describe some of the social characteristics of this linguistically defined group. On the other hand, Wolfram (1969) based the description of linguistic differences solely on pre-determined socio-economic groups. In the former case, it may be argued that the "natural" division of groups on a linguistic basis is a more reliable indication of sociolinguistic differences than the use of an objective socio-economic index which can only represent one manifestation of social class. In the latter case, it may be argued that the description of linguistic differences in terms of predetermined social groups takes advantage of what we do know about some of the objective indexes of social class and may have implications concerning the validity of social class distinctions. The two approaches are not, of course, mutually exclusive, so that one might manipulate his data to take full advantage of the insights to be derived from viewing the data both ways.

Although the heuristic procedure and theoretical model for handling the relationship between language and social differences may have important implications for the descriptive adequacy of sociolinguistic data, basic to all sociolinguistic investigations is the cause and effect relationship between social and language differences.

Due to the prevalent, if not universal, nature of social class in culture (even in so-called classless societies, where social class is not overtly acknowledged), we also assume that some type of language normativization will take place. To put it another way, language standardization is inevitable. For various socio-cultural reasons, all languages or dialects are not considered equal in their social acceptability, so that one of the languages or dialects becomes established as normative when compared with others[9]. Although we might give a general

definition of a standard language, such as a codified set of language norms which are considered socially acceptable, more specific definition is dependent on the particular language situation. In one case, it may be the language of a high-prestige group which becomes emulated by others. In another case a dialect or group of dialects may become standardized by default: that is, a dialect(s) NOT spoken by socially stigmatized groups. (This may, in fact, be the most operative definition of Standard English.) In another case, it may be defined in terms of socio-political dominance.

In many instances, the establishment of a standardized language is formal, through the codification of a norm in prescriptive grammars and codifying agencies such as the school, but it is also possible for a standardized language to be established through informal means. Language standardization can take place on two scales. In cross-cultural terms, one language may be set up as a standard language for a nation. In terms of intra-cultural framework, one dialect may be set up as a standard as opposed to others.

Garvin and Mathiot (1956), following Havránek (1955), have delimited several types of symbolic and objective functions of a standard language, which may aid us in understanding why language standardization seems to be so inevitable. A standard language, in the first place, may serve a unifying function by linking an individual speaker with a larger community. Whereas the unifying function may unite individual speakers, what is identified as the separatist function opposes the standard language to other languages or varieties as a separate entity, thus potentially serving as a symbol of national identity. Weinreich (1953: 100) points out that it is in a situation of language contact that people most easily become aware of the peculiarities of their language as against others, and in this situation the standardized language most readily becomes the symbol of group integrity. There is also a prestige function associated with a standard language. As Garvin and Mathiot observe:

> ...one of the ways of achieving equality with an admired high-prestige nationality is to make one's own language 'as good as theirs', which in our terms means bringing it closer to the ideal properties of a standard language (1956:788).

Whereas the previously mentioned functions are symbolic, an objective function served by a standard language is the frame-of-reference function. By providing a codified norm for correctness, speakers can be judged in terms of their conformity to that norm.

Garvin and Mathiot further point out that the functions of a standard language give rise to a set of cultural attitudes toward it. Related to the unifying and separatist functions of a standard language is an attitude of language loyalty, the prestige function produces an attitude of pride, and the frame-of-reference function results in an attitude of awareness of the norm.

Whatever socio-cultural reasons may account for the inevitability of language standardization, this fact must be realistically faced by sociolinguists. Linguists have traditionally objected to the notion of language standardization because of the imposition of prescriptive norms of "correctness" -- norms which are opposed to the descriptive framework in which linguists approach language. The basic objection lies in the fact that values of social propriety are misinterpreted as value judgments concerning linguistic adequacy. Despite the philosophical validity of linguists' objections or their ethical preference to eliminate the notion of standard and nonstandard languages, we must realistically concede that the establishment of prescriptive norms for "correct" speech usage is an inevitable by-product of the awareness of social class.[10]

As a concomitant of the above assumption about language, we must also assume that subjective reactions to speech are inevitable. Individuals do not respond to speech differences with objective detachment. Rather, they respond evaluatively based on their reactions (in most cases stereotypic) to the social differences that the language differences imply. One may generally note (but not universally since there may be exceptions) that the speech behavior of a socially stigmatized group will be considered stigmatized and a socially prestigious group will be considered high-prestige. In essence, when individuals react subjectively to the speech of a particular social group, they are expressing their attitudinal reactions toward the behavioral patterns of that group on the basis of one behavioral manifestation, language.

For example, the subjective reactions of middle-class white to lower-class black speech is, in reality, a reflection of a much more pervasive attitude toward the behavioral patterns of lower-class black culture. The rejection of the speech of this group must therefore be viewed in the wider context of cultural rejection.

The above paragraph only deals with subjective reactions to speech behavior with respect to the interaction of different social groups on a vertical dimension but it must also be pointed out that subjective reactions towards different types of speech events are also characteristic within a given social group, a horizontal dimension. Within the ethnography of speaking, not only the forms of speech but the uses of speech may be viewed evaluatively. What this means is that within a given social group there will be rules for "good and bad manners" with respect to speech usage. Certain types of speech uses will be valued positively and others negatively. For example, rapping in black culture refers to a distinctively fluent and lively way of talking, characterized by a high degree of personal style (see Kochman 1968:27). As a manipulative use of language, it is positively valued. On the other hand, loud-mouthing refers to the use of language in a forceful but non-manipulative way, and generally evokes a pejorative emotive response. In terms of vernacular culture, it is "bad speech manners." We must assume, that for each social group, there are indigenous values placed on certain uses of speech. It is the realization of a cultural value system with respect to speech that is the basis for subjective reactions to the form, content, and use of speech.

Implicit in several of the above assumptions relevant for linguistic research is the principle that speakers show variation in their linguistic rules based on the social context in which speech occurs. Labov puts it:

> One of the fundamental principles of sociolinguistic investigation might be stated as: there are no single-style speakers. By this we mean that every speaker will show some variation in phonological and syntactic rules according to the immediate context in which he is speaking (1969b:13).

In the process of enculturation, speakers not only acquire competence in a linguistic code, but competence in the use of certain variations which are dependent on social context. In contexts determined by some of the factors we mentioned previously, such as the

relation of participants, settings, and topic, variations in speech can be expected. To put it another way, we must assume, in the sociolinguistic consideration of language, an "ethnography of speaking" (see Hymes 1962).

To assume that there will be some stylistic range for all individuals does not, however, imply that the same range and competence can be expected from different speakers. Labov notes:

> One must add of course that the stylistic range and competence of the speaker may vary greatly. Children may have a very narrow range in both the choices open to them and the social contexts they respond to. Old men often show a narrow range in that their motivation for style shifting disappears along with their concern for power relationships (Labov 1969b:13).

Despite the variations in the range of styles between different speakers, it is most reasonable to assume that all speakers who have acquired a language system have also acquired some flexibility in the use of alternative structures within that system.

One may wonder, at this point, how the notion of stylistic variation relates to the distinction between what Bernstein (1964) has called the restricted and elaborated code. Although some have taken this to mean that lower-class speakers are single and middle-class multi-style speakers, one cannot accept this interpretation. A closer look at Bernstein reveals that he is talking about the relative not absolute reduction in the alternatives which are open in speech. (This, in fact, is one reason why the notions of restricted and elaborated codes lose their usefulness when trying to experiment with these concepts.) Bernstein maintains:

> ...with a restricted code, the range of alternatives, syntactic alternatives, is considerably reduced and so it is much more likely that prediction is possible. ...In the case of elaborated code, the speech system requires a higher level of verbal planning for the preparation of speech than in the case of restricted code (1964:57).

That a particular social group may be "limited" to a restricted code does not mean that they have only one style of speech. Whatever criticisms one may make of the theoretical and methodological basis of Bernstein's research, it cannot be argued that restricted code refers to uni-style and elaborated to multi-style speakers. What he does say is that a difference in the range of grammatical alternatives may be related to social class; he is thus attempting to give one

explanation to account for the observation that there are competencies with respect to stylistic ranges. The verification of this hypothesis, however, is still needed.

In the preceding discussion, we have explicated some o the basic assumptions underlying the behavioral role of language in society. Because assumptions about the behavioral role of language are not as frequently stated as those relating to the language as code, it may well be that more assumptions or qualifications of the assumptions presented here will have to be explicated. What is essential here is the fact that the study of social dialects by linguists is based on two sets of assumptions, one dealing with the structure of the language system and one relating to the structure of society. It is the combination of these assumptions, which in many ways are interrelated, that is the foundation for sociolinguistic research by linguists.

II. Current Research[11]

Within the discipline of linguistics, it is the field of dialectology which was responsible for the earliest attempts to account for social variation in speech. American dialectologists recognized that social differences had to be considered, even though the primary goal of dialect geography was the correlation of settlement history with regional varieties of English. Kurath, for example, in directing the Linguistic Atlas of the United States and Canada was aware that social differences intersected with settlement history and geographical differences to account for linguistic variation. As reported in the Handbook of the Linguistic Geography of New England, Linguistic Atlas fieldworkers divided informants into three main types, as follows:

> Type I : Little formal education, little reading and restricted social contacts.
>
> Type II : Better formal education (usually high school) and/or wider reading and social contacts.
>
> Type III : Superior education (usually college), cultured background, wide reading and/or extensive social contacts (Kurath 1939:44).

In addition, each of the above types was subdivided as:

> Type A : Aged, and/or regarded by the fieldworker as old-fashioned.
>
> Type B : Middle-aged or younger, and/or regarded by the fieldworker as more modern (Kurath 1939:44).

Although different social types were recognized in the work of the Linguistic Atlas several difficulties were apparent because the social parameter was not adequately considered. The social classification of informants was dependent on the fieldworkers' subjective impressions. The vagueness with which the social types were profiled (e.g. "little reading and restricted social contacts") caused the social classification of informants to be unreliable. Furthermore, no verifiable sociological model for rating the social status of informants was utilized. Education, which seemed to be primary in the evaluation of informants, is only one of the various factors which is used by social scientists in rating social status. Finally, the classification scheme was applied circularly. The criteria for classifying some groups of informants were not based on extra-verbal behavior, but on the dependent variable of language itself.

Whereas the correlation of social with linguistic differences was of secondary concern in the work of the Linguistic Atlas (Kurath 1941, 1949), later interpretation of the Linguistic Atlas data gave more direct attention to the importance of social factors in accounting for linguistic diversity. Dialectologists, however, still seemed to appeal to the social parameter only when "data proved too complicated to be explained by merely a geographical statement or a statement of settlement history" (McDavid 1948:194). Thus, McDavid's "Postvocalic -r in South Carolina: A social analysis" (1948) amends a geographical explanation of postvocalic -r in the Piedmont area of South Carolina by analyzing the intersection of social class with geographical differences. As will be seen later, dialectologists continue to work with the social consequences of speech variation, but the methods of "mainstream dialectologists" such as Kurath, McDavid, and Pederson have actually changed very little.

Levine and Crockett (1967) also investigated the variation of postvocalic -r in a Piedmont community, but the analytical method is considerably more refined with respect to sampling and statistics. For one, they were concerned with inter-transcriber and intra-transcriber reliability. Statistical tests were also applied to

quantitative results so that the significance of results could be determined technically instead of impressionistically. Finally, there is a comparison of postvocalic -r in two types of style, a word list and a sentence style.

From another perspective, anthropological linguists have made significant contributions to the study of linguistic correlates of social stratification in the last decade. Whereas dialectologists have been satisfied with rough approximations of social divisions to which linguistic phenomena may be related, anthropologists have characteristically been rigorous in their differentiation of social groups to which linguistic variables may be related. Independent ethnographical description of behavioral patterns characterizing different social strata is required before any correlation of linguistic variables with these strata can be made. Research on the social stratification of linguistic features has been pioneered by Gumperz (1958a, 1958b, 1961, 1964), Hymes (1961, 1964), and Bright (1960, 1964, 1966). For example, Gumperz, in several articles (1958a, 1958b), has shown how linguistic variables, particularly phonological variables, relate to the caste systems of India. Southeastern Asia, perhaps because of its rigid stratification between castes, has received the most extensive consideration by anthropological linguists. Anthropological linguists such as Hymes and Gumperz have concerned themselves with developing a structural taxonomy of the factors which must be dealt with from a sociolinguistic perspective of verbal behavior, such as settings, participants, topics, and functions of interaction. Limited consideration has been given to American English by anthropological linguists, although Fischer (1958) provided an analysis of the morphemic variation between the suffixal participle /-ɪŋ/ and /-ɪn/ in English by considering the social background of 24 children in a New England village.

It was Labov's work on the social stratification of English in New York city (1963a, 1963b, 1965a, 1966b, 1966c), more than any other research, that has sharpened the theoretical and methodological bases for sociolinguistic research. Using a survey by the Mobilization for Youth as his sociological model, he analyzed the speech of over a

hundred randomly selected informants. Five different phonological variables (oh, eh, r, th, dh), isolated in four contextual styles (careful speech, casual speech, reading, word lists) were correlated with the social stratification of the informants. Labov made several major contributions to the study of linguistic correlates of social stratification. In the first place, he used sociologically valid procedures in selecting the informants for his sample. Many linguists prior to Labov were largely satisfied with biased, non-random informant selection. Also, Labov's quantitative measurement of linguistic variables, although not the first, was considerably more extensive than any previous sociolinguistic research. Further, his effort to isolate contextual styles on the basis of extra-linguistic "channel cues" was a careful attempt to define interview styles in linguistics. The major contribution of Labov was his demonstration that speech differences within a community, often dismissed by linguists as "free variation", systematically correlated with social differences.

The Detroit Dialect Study (Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1967), experimented with several different methods of analyzing speech differences. It extended the insights of Labov on the linguistic variable to grammatical as well as phonological variables. An attempt to measure differences by the quantitative measurement of structural types (e.g. clause and phrase types) was also investigated.

Despite a developing sociolinguistic tradition within linguistics over the past several decades, the actual structural description of nonstandard dialects has received little attention.[12] To a certain degree, this lack of attention can be attributed to the attitude that nonstandard speech is less worthy of interest than the study of socially acceptable varieties of English. Another contributing factor for this neglect may have been the assumption that the nonstandard dialects were minimally different in their structure and that when comprehensive studies of standard English were completed, it would be a relatively simple matter to adjust grammatical descriptions to include nonstandard varieties. With respect to Black English, descriptive attention was no doubt delayed by dialectologists who maintained that it was not essentially different from the speech of

Southern whites of comparable socio-economic levels. As an example of such a view, note Kurath's conclusions from his work on the Linguistic Atlas

> By and large the Southern Negro speaks the language of the white man of his locality or area and of his education.... As far as the speech of the uneducated Negroes is concerned, it differs little from that of the illiterate white; that is, it exhibits the same regional and local variations as that of the simple white folk (1949:6).

Stewart (1965:13) observes that the structural neglect of Black English may also have been related to concern for the feelings of Negroes:

> As this [the study of Black English] relates to the speech of Negroes, it has been reinforced by a commendable desire to emphasize the potential of the Negro to be identical with white Americans and accordingly to deemphasize any current behavioral patterns which might not seem to contribute directly to that goal... respect for the feelings of Negroes themselves has probably played a part in discouraging the study of Negro speech. For, as is quite understandable, many Negroes (particularly educated ones) are somewhat sensitive about any public focus on distinctively Negro behavior, particularly if it happens to be that of lower class Negroes.

Whatever the reasons may have been, it was not until the last few years that the study of Black English has been seriously undertaken. Although there are several current research projects on the linguistic structure of Black English, by comparison, there are still only a limited number of linguists who have taken an interest in this area.

Stewart (1964, 1967, 1968) and Bailey (1965) probably did more to turn the attention of linguists to the study of Black English than any one else, partly because their work on this dialect chronologically preceded other linguists and partly because of their dogmatic rejection of the dialectological treatment of ethnic differences in speech. Coming from creolist backgrounds, both Bailey and Stewart maintained that Black English was not identical to the speech of Southern whites of a comparable socio-economic class, but significantly different. Bailey, for example, noted:

> I would like to suggest that the Southern Negro "dialect" differs from other Southern speech because its deep structure is different, having its origins as it undoubtedly does in some Proto-Creole grammatical structure (1965:172).

Obviously, such a position comes into sharp conflict with the traditional position suggested by a number of American dialectologists.

What then, can account for this sharp difference of opinion? One explanation is that dialectologists have focused their attention on the similarities between nonstandard Negro dialects and white dialects, whereas creolists have focused on the differences between these two varieties of English. Dialectologists have been largely occupied with phonological and lexical differences, the levels on which the dialects are nearly (but not completely) alike. Creolists, on the other hand, have concerned themselves with subtle differences in grammatical categories. Stewart has mainly concentrated on the historical relations of Black English to what he considers a creole origin. He notes:

> Of those Africans who fell victim to the Atlantic slave trade and were brought to the New World, many found it necessary to learn some kind of English. With very few exceptions, the form of English which they acquired was a pidginized one, and this kind of English became so well-established as the principal medium of communication between Negro slaves in the British colonies that it was passed on as a creole language to succeeding generations of the New World Negroes, for whom it was their native tongue (1967:22).

Present-day Negro dialect, according to Stewart, has resulted from a process which he labels "decreolization" (i.e. the loss of creole features). Through contact with the British-derived dialects the creole variety of English spoken by Negroes merged with other dialects of English. The merging process, however, was neither instantaneous nor complete. Stewart asserts:

> Indeed, the non-standard speech of present-day American Negroes still seems to exhibit structural traces of a creole predecessor, and this is probably a reason why it is in some ways more deviant from standard English than is the non-standard speech of even the most uneducated American whites (1968:3).

Stewart substantiates his claim that Negro dialects are derived from a widespread slave creole by examining the close relationship which is found between 18th and 19th century Negro dialect and other New World creoles (Stewart 1967). His source for the study of 18th and 19th century Negro dialect is the representations of Negro dialect used in the literary works of this period. Although this may seem like an unreliable source, Stewart's knowledge of the literary records of Negro dialect during this period and his apparent ability

to evaluate the reliability of the various authors makes his historical documentation quite plausible. Furthermore, Stewart's familiarity with a number of different creoles, including Gullah and the Caribbean creoles, lends credibility to statements he makes concerning the relations of various Black English structures to a creole predecessor. Although Stewart's knowledge of Black English is not disputed, several points he makes do not appear to be as clear-cut as he asserts. For one, his approach to analysis concentrates on particular items rather than a holistic approach to the structure of Black English. An attempt to assemble a comprehensive inventory of differences between Southern whites and Negroes of comparable socio-economic classes may lead one to a considerably smaller list than claimed.

Furthermore, the origins of some of the items would certainly be disputed by dialectologists. Others might be disputed on empirical grounds. For example, Stewart observes that implosive stops, which he claims are quite easy for the trained phonetician to perceive are unique to the Black English speaker. But there are some linguists who would claim that the American English stop can sometimes be implosive. Furthermore, I know of several competent phoneticians who agree that both Black and white speakers use implosives. At any rate, the issue is not nearly as clear-cut as Stewart makes it out to be.

Finally, Stewart emphasizes differences between Black English and standard English as opposed to similarities. This in itself may be justified since it is the differences which cause interference between dialects. It must be pointed out however, that the inventory of differences is much smaller than the inventory of similarities. In addition, the clear majority of differences seem to be on a surface rather than an underlying level (see, e.g. Labov, et al 1968). An expansive list is lacking, either because the list is simply not as exhaustive as suggested or because descriptive data are still lacking.

From a purely descriptive viewpoint there are several current projects which merit attention. Probably the most radical of these is offered by Loflin (1967b, 1968, 1969) of the Center for Research in Social Behavior at the University of Missouri. Loflin considers the differences between standard English and Black English to be of

such significance that Black English be treated as a foreign language. He observes:

> Efforts to construct a grammar for Nonstandard Negro English suggest that the similarities between it and Standard English are superficial. There is every reason, at this stage of research to believe that a fuller description of Nonstandard Negro English will show a grammatical system which must be treated as a foreign language (1967a:1312).

In justification of his treatment of Black English as a significantly different system (i.e. different in its underlying structure) from standard English, he has described the verb system.[13] He concludes that aspect dominates over tense in Black English, whereas the opposite is true for standard English. A careful look at his description reveals that it must be challenged both on empirical and theoretical grounds. For example, one of the basic justifications for his description of the verb system of Black English is the absence of the auxiliary _have_ in the text of his _single_ informant; empirical investigation of the staff at the Center for Applied Linguistics in Washington, Labov in New York, and Wolfram in Detroit clearly reveals the underlying presence of _have_ (although it may be deleted by a low level phonological rule). In fact, one of the striking things about Black English seems to be the frequent use of the past form of this construction in narrative discourse (e.g. _He had came to the store_).

Other parts of Loflin's analysis of the verbal system reveal a neglect of the overall patterning of Black English. Thus, for example, the clear evidence that a phonological pattern is responsible for the absence of most past tense -_ed_ suffixes is overlooked (see, e.g. Wolfram 1969:71-74). Although Loflin's work certainly shows a high degree of creativity, his general approach and specific description of the Black English verb system can hardly be considered valid.

A somewhat different attempt to describe the linguistic structure of Child Black English in Florida is offered by Houston (1969). A number of informal phonological rules are given, but no grammatical rules since, according to Houston, "only four major syntactic differences between Child Black and standard White English have appeared" (1969:606). To those linguists seriously attempting to describe the

structure of Black English, Houston's description shows descriptive and observational inadequacies. From a theoretical standpoint, her approach to the description of Black English cannot be considered acceptable from any current taxonomic or generative standpoint. Her rules are, by her own admission, nothing more than a set of correspondences which relate Child Black English to White Standard English, yet she sets up her correspondences in the form of processes so that they have the form of pseudo-rewrite rules. Her justification for this curious device is "convenience," hardly a sufficient reason for the theoretical or descriptive linguist. In essence, what she does is derive surface forms in Black English from surface forms in standard White English. The rules are even given as ordered, yet any descriptive linguist can see that they are not "ordered" in the sense that this concept is used from any standpoint in linguistics.

Some of the rules she gives also lack formal motivation. Although she mentions general postulates which govern the treatment of phenomena as phonological instead of grammatical ("their relative generality in the language as a whole, and the importance of the grammatical claims") (1969:603), some of the rules she treats as phonological can be seriously disputed. Why, for example, is the third person singular -Z a phonological rule rather than a grammatical rule? Third person singular -Z affects all verbs, not only those involving consonant clusters (e.g. it affects boo: as well as dreams). Yet, lack of formal motivation for the correspondence is lacking so that the rules appear to simply be ad hoc. Some of the rules which are given, furthermore, do not describe the data which they presumably are supposed to account for. Thus, as the rule for consonant cluster reduction is formally stated ($XVC_1 + C_2 \# XVC_1 \#$, where X may be zero, C = any consonant, and + is morpheme boundary), it can account only for bimorphemic clusters. This means it can account for guessed being realized as /gɛs/, but not a monomorphemic cluster like guest, which is realized as /gɛs/. Such apparent oversights are, unfortunately, characteristic of the rules.

And finally, some of the empirical data she displays are suspect. Stewart, Labov, and the staff at the Center for Applied Linguistics working with Black English would all have disputes about some of her

observed data. Even if she treats a number of apparently grammatical phenomena as phonological, she does not mention differences in verbal paradigms, modals, person agreement, existential it, pleonastic forms other than pronominal apposition, etc. In the light of these theoretical and empirical inadequacies, Houston's study cannot be considered as an observationally and descriptively adequate account of the structure of Black English from a linguistic perspective.

The research of Labov and associates (1965, 1968) on the structure of the nonstandard speech of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in New York is the single most exhaustive study of a nonstandard speech community available.[14] Having already cited contributions that Labov made to sociolinguistics in his study of the overall population of New York City, we must again cite a number of significant sociolinguistic innovations in his Harlem research. In the first place, his study of language in the setting of an adolescent peer group broke with the individual interview method. Furthermore, he has described both the functional and structural aspects of the nonstandard vernacular. The structural description of Black English included more features of the phonology and grammar of Black English in detail than any other single description. In addition to Labov's creative innovations in field methods and his comprehensive sociolinguistic description of Black English, he has carefully examined the implications that his research has for theoretical linguistics. Based on his elicitation of peer group speech in a relatively spontaneous setting, he has observed that many of the variants associated with Black English must be considered "inherently variable" with more standard-like variants. That is, fluctuation between many variants seems to be inherent to the vernacular structure and not simply an "importation" from a superimposed variety.[15] Evidence for this is found in the systematic ways in which certain types of fluctuation seem to operate within the most indigenous speech situation.

Labov points out that independent linguistic as well as social variables must be considered in describing the systematic variation of forms. The correlation of sociological with linguistic variables to

account for fluctuation between forms has become well-established within the last decade of sociolinguistic research. But the notion of systematic variation as a function of independent linguistic variables has not been considered seriously. The fact that linguistic environment can greatly affect the variability of items has some important implications on the concept of "optionality" in linguistics. The limitation of linguistics to qualitative, discrete units has somehow precluded any affect that linguistic environment may have on variability. This is not to say that a statement of the relevant environments in which so-called "free variation" took place was not a requisite for adequate linguistic description. But the recognition that certain environments may affect the occurrence of a given variant much more than others was characteristically absent. Yet, the variables described by Labov and others (see, e.g. Wolfram 1969) show that certain types of linguistic environments intersect with extra-linguistic factors to account for variation between forms. Labov, therefore, has suggested that the notion of linguistic and non-linguistic constraints be incorporated into the formal representation of a linguistic rule. He has thus proposed what he calls the variable rule (1968:24). By introducing the variable rule, Labov attempts to formally incorporate the constraints (linguistic and non-linguistic) which directly affect the variability of items. To chieve this end, Labov suggests that "we associate with each variable rule a specific quantity which denotes the proportion of cases in which the rule applies as part of the rule structure itself" (Labov 1968:25). The value of a variable rule is defined as a function of the constraints which limit the categorical operation of the rule. This may be represented as:

$$f = 1 - (a + b + c + \ldots n)$$

where f = the frequency of application, 1 the categorical operation of a rule, and a, b, c, ...n the various constraints limiting categorical rule application (i.e. the variable input). The constraints are "ranked" -- ranked in sense that certain linguistic environments clearly outweigh others in their effect on variability (e.g. $a > b > c > \ldots n$).

Labov's careful examination of the Black English system and field techniques is by far the most detailed in many areas although the

description of certain features will certainly not find unanimous agreement (see, e.g. Wolfram 1969:192-194). His incorporation of the variable rule into a formal grammar will, no doubt, stir up considerable disagreement among linguists. The controversy over the rule does not concern its observational adequacy, but whether this can and should be included in the formal description of a grammar. Is this rule simply part of a "performance" model, and, as such, irrelevant to the descriptive adequacy of a grammar, or is this an integral part of language "competence"? The quantitative figures which can be assigned to various constraints would seem to be part of performance model, but the regular and hierarchical effect of various linguistic constraints on variability cannot be dismissed quite as readily. This is, no doubt, an issue that is destined to be of considerable importance for theoretical linguistics.

The research undertaken by the Sociolinguistics Program at the Center for Applied Linguistics deals both with the linguistic correlates of stratification in the Negro community and the structural description of Black English. Data from several different locations are being analyzed, including Washington, D.C., Detroit, Michigan (a continuation of the Detroit Dialect Study under the direction of Roger Shuy), and more recently, Holmes County, Mississippi. Wolfram's study of the Detroit Negro population demonstrates how several classes of Negroes are differentiated on the basis of grammatical and phonological variables. The role of social status, sex, age, and racial isolation are all shown to correlate with linguistic differences. In addition, the extent to which the social differentiation between linguistic variables is quantitative or qualitative, the relation between social diagnostic phonological and grammatical variables and the effect of independent linguistic constraints on variability are examined.

The investigation of phonological and grammatical variables reveals that the phonological differences between social groups tend to be quantitative whereas the grammatical differences are often qualitative. Three of the four phonological variables (word-final consonant clusters ending in a stop, syllable-final d, and postvocalic r) indicate that the social groups are differentiated primarily on the basis of the relative frequency of variants. Only the θ variable, which shows the categorical

absence of the f variant in middle-class speech, indicates a qualitative difference between social groups. On the other hand, all four grammatical variables (multiple negation, suffixal -Z, copula absence, and invariant be) reveal the categorical absence of certain variants among middle-class informants.

By introducing the concepts of "sharp" (i.e. a significant difference in the frequency of particular variants between contiguous social groups) and "gradient" (i.e. a progressive difference in the frequency of particular variants between social groups) ar important difference in the way phonological and grammatical variables stratify the population can be observed. Grammatical variables usually show sharp stratification, whereas phonological variables show gradient stratification. All the grammatical variables investigated in the study reveal sharp stratification, whereas three of the four phonological variables indicate gradient stratification.

Finally, Wolfram's research demonstrates that it is impossible to arrive at an adequate understanding of the nature of sociolinguistic variation without considering the effects of independent linguistic constraints. In accounting for frequency differences among variants it is essential to consider the effect of linguistic environment as well as social variables.

Wolfram's work reinforces many of the conclusions that Labov has independently come to in his research in New York, suggesting that there is considerable uniformity in the patterning of Black English in large, Northern metropolitan areas. Wolfram's limited sample (48 informants), however, needs extension, particularly in order to validify his conclusions about age, sex, and racial isolation. Statistical sophistication is also lacking in some of his conclusions based on quantitative differences. Finally, the functional reasons for certain types of differences, although important, are not examined. For example, is the pattern of sex differentiation due to different types of contact situations that males and females have with the socially superordinate white community (e.g. female domestics working in close contact with middle-class white females) or is this an indigenous behavioral characteristic of the Negro community (e.g. the use of socially stigmatized forms is a symbol of masculinity)?

Fasold's research in Washington, D.C. currently includes a study of the social stratification of speech in the Negro community and the structural description of various features of Black English. Recently Fasold (1970) has explicated one of the crucial issues for the representation of sociolinguistic information from a linguistic perspective, namely, "implicational analysis." "frequency analysis or a combination of the two. The former approach deals with the implication of the presence of certain socially diagnostic linguistic features for the presence/absence of others (cf. DeCamp 1969); frequency analysis involves the variability of linguistic features as they relate to social class (cf. Labov et al 1968), and the combination of the two approaches uses the statistical method of "factor analysis" to deal both with the frequency of occurrence and the co-occurrence restrictions of variants (cf. Ma and Herasimchuk). In investigating these various approaches, Fasold suggests that the more adequate approach is probably the one that can most readily incorporate the insights of the other. He concludes that frequency analysis can incorporate the insights of continuum analysis by simply including an "invariance category," whereas continuum analysis must arbitrarily assign any observed variability between features into binary categories. He submits that the third approach, that of combining continuum and frequency approaches via factor analysis is the least revealing because it only leads to groupings that already are obvious. Also, there is no apparent way to incorporate factor analysis into linguistic theory. It appears, however, that Fasold has dismissed the third alternative too lightly. Theoretically, it holds the potential to reveal less than obvious continuum sets, and to validate apparent groupings. If it then proves to be valid, it is the task of linguistic theory to incorporate this concept.

Another important area currently being investigated by Roger Shuy and colleagues is that of the relation between white southern and Negro speech of comparable socio-economic classes, based on data from Holmes County, Mississippi. Although still at a preliminary stage of analysis, it is hoped that these data will reveal concrete answers to the controversy of Negro/white speech differences in the deep South.

One recent study of Negro speech in the South has been conducted by Anshen (1969). Following up an earlier study of the sociolinguistic parameters of a Piedmont community by Levine and Crockett (cf. p. 114), Anshen investigated four phonological variables of the Negro community in Hillsborough, North Carolina: ing, postvocalic r, word-initial dh and th. Several major conclusions are arrived at. First, it is shown that there are regular patterns of sociolinguistic variation typical of patterns found in other communities. Thus, the higher the education (but not necessarily the occupation, because of the job opportunities for Negroes in the South, the more standard-like the speech; females tend to approximate standard English norms more than males; older speakers are generally more standard in their speech than younger ones; stylistic changes result in changes in the frequencies of variants. Comparing some of his data with that of the white community studied by Levine and Crockett, Anshen also concludes that the frequency differences between scores for Negroes and whites in this area suggest that these two groups of speakers speak different varieties of English. However, since Anshen was limited to the study of variables which have social significance for the general American population his arguments are based only on quantitative evidence. A much stronger argument for different speech varieties could be made if qualitative differences were brought out.

Several dissertations recently written at the University of California at Berkeley have dealt with selected aspects of Black English. Henrie (1969) has studied the verb phrases of three lower-class black kindergarten children and compared them with two middle-class white children as a "control" group. One of the innovative aspects of Henrie's study was his technique for eliciting speech. First, he carefully constructed a number of stories of 5-15 sentences which contained all the verb phrase forms and distribution of semantic qualities of interest. Each sentence of the story, given in standard English, was accompanied by a corresponding illustration, and these illustrations were shown to the children as the sentences were taught them. Subsequently, they retold the stories and, according to Henrie, this resulted in the productions of the child's own habitual speech patterns while meaning was held constant by the stories and accompanying illustrations.

The data were therefore ordered in two ways. Holding the semantic features constant, each form could be listed first as it appeared in the input story, then as was produced by the standard English control subjects, and finally as it was produced by the Black English speaking subjects. Holding major verb phrase forms constant, the various semantic combinations attached to each was tabulated and a dominant meaning of each Black English form could de derived. The classification and ordering of data made it possible to (1) describe Black English translation equivalents for standard English verb phrase forms and the range of possible meanings for Black English forms, (2) discover whether Black English forms vary systematically in meaning from each other and/or standard English forms, and (3) separate Black English forms specific to Black English from those which are simply age-related forms.

The fluctuation between standard English and Black English-like forms that Henrie finds among his lower-class black informants matches other quantitative studies of the speech of lower-class blacks. The correlation of verb forms with semantic contexts also parallels other studies of Black English with several important exceptions. One such exception shows up in his analysis of "unconjugated be". He suggests that the meaning of be (that is, those instances of be not derived from underlying will or would be) is not necessarily limited to an habitual type of activity, as has sometimes been maintained (e.g. Fasold 1969; Stewart 1967; Wolfram 1969). Another exception involves the absence of third person, singular present-tense -Z (e.g. He do). Whereas the analysis of Labov et al. (1968) and Wolfram (1969) maintain that there is no deep structure difference relating to the absence of -Z, Henrie raises this possibility. Some of the apparent exceptions brought out by Henrie might be due to the fact that semantic context is difficult to control even given the rigorous elicitation techniques he has developed. If the sentences which "were taught to them" actually resulted in the production of "the child's own habitual speech patterns", we must ask to what extent we can assume the constancy of meaning.

Another Berkeley dissertation by Mitchell-Kernan describes a number of features of Black English, based primarily on the speech of two adult female informants. Although this description is useful in observing the similarities between Black English in different geographical regions, the actual linguistic description does not go into the qualitative or

quantitative detail that some of the other descriptions go into. A major focus of Mitchell-Kernan's study, however, is the attempt to give an ethnographic description of several ritualistic types of speech acts, including signifying, marking, and loud-talking. She offers some useful observations on the function of these speech acts within the vernacular community.

McKay (1969) offers a quite extensive description of several selected features of Black English based on the speech of an elderly Negro lady originally from Louisiana. The structures dealt with include negative sentences, relative clauses, existential sentences, direct questions, embedded questions and indirect discourse. An important aspect of McKay's study is the formalization of the standard English rules (in terms of generative transformational grammar) and the comparison of these rules with the rules that are needed to generate a grammar for her informant. With respect to the comparison of rules, she concluded that the two varieties share the same phrase structure rules, differing mainly with respect to certain types of transformational rules. The Black English grammar contains many more deletion rules.

Since McKay's analysis is restricted to unstructured informal conversations with her informant, there are gaps in the data with respect to some of the crucial aspects of her analysis. For example, in her discussion of negatives, she concludes that there are not sentences containing only a negated indefinite subject and a negated post-auxiliary indefinite. This means that a sentence such as Nobody saw her no more is ungrammatical, Nobody didn't see her no more being the expected Black English sentence. But we do not know if the ungrammaticality of the former sentence is due to a gap in the data (which is what we may suspect on the basis of other analyses of Black English) or genuinely reflective of underlying competence. Since there is no attempt at eliciting some of the crucial structures for writing the rules, some of the conclusions must be very tenuous. Nonetheless, McKay's study is a significant attempt to formalize some of the rules of Black English vis-a-vis the rules of standard English.

Although the above mentioned studies describe current major research dealing with the study of nonstandard dialects in the United States,

there are several other studies that can be mentioned briefly. We have already seen how the work of American dialectologists was one of the earliest attempts to deal with social factors in linguistic diversity within linguistics. The more recent work of McDavid and Austin (1967), Pederson (1965) and Williamson (1961) indicates a continued interest in this area. However, retention of Linguistic Atlas techniques, now superseded by more sophisticated sociological and anthropological techniques, places such research at a serious disadvantage. The continued emphasis on lexical items and phonology preclude a comprehensive structural description of a nonstandard grammar. Current studies of social dialects by dialectologists have also neglected the systematic nature of variation that quantitative studies of variability reveal. Furthermore, the apparent disinterest in the implications of such research for linguistic theory does not coincide with the direction of current sociolinguistic studies.

There are also several projects which can only be mentioned briefly because of their incipient nature. Fraser and colleagues at the Language Research Foundation are presently beginning the description of Child Black English in New York City, employing the most current insights of theoretical linguistics. Fieldwork in this project however, has just begun.

The sociolinguistics aspect (there is also a pedogogical aspect) of the study by Legum, Williams and associates (1968), under the auspices of the Southwest Regional Laboratory at Inglewood is presently conducting interviews with child peer groups in Watts. At this stage, only the statement of the theoretical linguistic and sociolinguistic foundations of their research is available and these are derived mainly from Labov's research.

Finally, the East Texas Dialect Project, directed by Troike and Galvan at the University of Texas (1968, 1969), has conducted interviews with over 200 informants in five communities in East Texas, representing different races, several socio-economic levels, and various age groups. The interview involved the elicitation of free conversation between a fieldworker and two informants. Preliminary exploration has resulted in the isolation of a number of different phonological and grammatical variables for analysis, and the frequency of socially significant variants is now being analyzed.

III. Directions for Future Research

On the basis of our previous discussion of research projects, it should be apparent that some aspects of social dialects are being studied thoroughly while others are neglected. It is therefore the purpose of this section to summarize areas which have been investigated adequately and to suggest the direction that future research might take.[16] These can conveniently be discussed in terms of three main areas: (1) field techniques, (2) descriptive studies, and (3) theoretical issues.

1. Field techniques. As was seen in the preceding section, sociolinguistic field procedures by linguists have made rapid progress within the last several years. We now see that the design of fieldwork and sampling procedures can give a reliable representation of the sociolinguistic parameters of a community (see, for example, Labov 1966a, Chapter 6, or Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968, Chapter 2). Current interview procedures have also developed according to social science standards of interviewing (see Labov 1966, Chapter 5, or Shuy, Wolfram and Riley 1968, Chapter 5-7, or Slobin 1967) so that many of the criticisms of Pickford (1956) concerning the inadequacy of the Linguistic Atlas fieldwork design are no longer applicable to current sociolinguistic research. Furthermore, elicitation procedures, particularly as related to stylistic variation, have made significant advances following the insights of Labov (1966a, 1968).

There are, however, several areas in which further refinement of research design can add to the validity and reliability of sociolinguistic studies. With respect to sampling, we are still not certain of the most efficient size for a reliable study of social dialects. What, for example, is the minimal number of informants in each social "cell" for the linguist to adequately characterize the linguistic behavior of that cell? It appears that linguistic behavior is more uniform than some other types of behavior investigated by sociologists so that we can conceivably achieve reliability using a smaller sample than other types of sociological surveys. Also, because of the detailed nature of certain types of linguistic analysis, it is impractical to work with samples the size of some sociological surveys. But we still do not

know what constitutes a minimally adequate representation for the study of social dialects. One way of getting at such information would be to take a reasonably large sample such as the Detroit Dialect Study (which included over 700 interviews) and compare several linguistic features using different sizes of subsamples within the large study to establish a minimal standard for a reliable sample. Information of this type could determine the most efficient size of future social dialect surveys.

Another area where we lack adequate information concerns the role of the fieldworker in influencing the speech of informants. We suspect that the race, sex, or social class of the interviewer might be important conditioning factors with respect to speech, and there are several studies which show such factors to correlate with speech variation (e.g. Anshen 1969). But we still need an exhaustive study of the relative importance of the social characteristics of the interviewer. For example, is the correlation between the race of the interviewer and the informant's speech variation simply a function of race, or is it actually more related to a person's ability to identify with the social class of the informant, or, is it a combination of these? And, if such correlations exist, do they affect all socially diagnostic linguistic variables or only those on a more conscious level? These are questions about the interview which will suggest the relative importance of controlling interviewer variables.

One area of top priority for field techniques is the establishment of elicitation procedures which can get at judgments of the grammaticality of nonstandard structures apart from judgments about social acceptability. The linguist's usual procedure is to obtain a language sample in order to determine the rules of the grammar and then directly ask the native informant whether or not certain grammatical contrasts that he reconstructs from his rules are indeed significant in his language (i.e. can they be generated by the rules of his grammar?). This same procedure, however, cannot be used in dealing with the grammaticality of nonstandard sentences, since it is virtually impossible to get such judgments isolated from social notions of acceptability (i.e. the Miss Fiditch notion of "correctness"). Thus, for example, if a linguist were to ask a Black English informant if a sentence such as Didn't nobody

do nothing were acceptable, he is liable to have the informant reject the sentence. But we cannot be sure if the informant rejected the senterce because it is not part of his competence or because of the social stigmatization of the sentence. Ideally, this might be overcome by a linguistically sophisticated native speaker of Black English. However, in my experience, most linguistically sophisticated speakers of Black English have also acquired standard English, and, in doing so, have invariably lost sensitivity to the grammatical boundaries of the Black English vernacular, which are so important in establishing underlying competence. It is therefore imperative that we develop methods by which we can get at the generative capacity of the Black English grammar rules. In order to do so, we must take advantage of more indirect ways of getting at competence. One important way may be through the development of different types of "word games." For example, Fasold (personal communication) has been experimenting with a sentence completion technique in which the informant is given a stimulus sentence and asked to respond to the sentence on the basis of a pattern which will determine whether or not the given feature is present in the underlying structure. To illustrate, consider whether or not the underlying auxiliary have is an integral part of the Black English grammatical system. The informant is given a sentence such as They been there a long time, and asked to respond to this sentence by completing the response I know they _____. If the informant responds by completing the sentence with have, we may be assured that there is an underlying have; however, if he responds by using another auxiliary such as did, then he probably does not have the underlying auxiliary have. The establishment of such indirect techniques to get at competence is important for future structural descriptions of the nonstandard grammatical systems. Of course, one must be careful to use stimuli sentences and patterns which are indigenous to the dialect; this makes familiarity with the dialect a prerequisite. In developing procedures of this type, linguistic fieldwork can probably profit mostly from elicitation techniques for children (see Slobin, 1967; Menyuk 1969, Chapter 4) at various acquisitional levels, but other new techniques will also have to be established.

Finally, the linguist interested in the social parameters of language is still uncertain about the importance of statistical calculations in comparing the various quantitative measurements that are made. Both Labov (1968) and Wolfram (1969) rely heavily on quantitative evidence, but neither uses tests to determine the statistical significance of their quantitative differences. Linguists, because of a tradition of qualitative analysis, tend to ignore statistical calculations. In justification we may say that some of the quantitative differences are so prominent that statistical calculations are hardly needed. In other cases, it is the establishment of the general direction of different frequency scores that is more important than the significance between specific figures. Furthermore, the linguist might claim that his data are far more regular and reproducable than the type of data sociologists are used to analyzing via statistics. But we may be arguing from naiveté. At any rate, the relative importance of statistics for sociolinguistic study is an area which needs careful research and explication. We must know in what areas statistical calculations are expedient, what areas they are questionable and what areas they are inapplicable.

2. Descriptive studies. As we noted in our description of current research projects, there are several aspects of social dialects in the United States which have occupied the attention of linguists. Corresponding to the popular focus on Negroes in the inner city, we have witnessed a number of attempts to describe the grammatical and phonological structure of Black English, varying greatly in quality. Research in New York, Detroit, Washington, D.C., and Watts seems to give adequate representation of this dialect in the large urban areas, especially because of the apparent similarity in the structure of Black English in these areas. This is not to say that there are no regional differences, but the overall structure of the dialect shows striking similarities in these different locations. There are, of course, aspects of the dialect which have not been covered in detail, but the major features of the dialect can be derived by looking at the various studies. One descriptive aspect which has not been covered in any of these studies is intonation, yet most linguists agree that there are substantial intonational differences between Black English and other varieties of English.

The correlation of social class with linguistic variables in large urban areas is also receiving an increasing amount of attention. The relationship of various parameters of social class have or are currently being described for New York, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Pittsburgh, and Fort Wayne, so that we are obtaining a representative number of studies on language and social class.

There are, however, still a number of areas which have received little or no attention. In the preceding paragraph one can note that the majority of studies of Black English focus on large Northern areas. We need adequate descriptive studies of Black English in both the rural and urban South. Such studies must be the first step in comparing the linguistic assimilation that takes place when mass migration takes place, as it did during the last fifty years among the Negro population. Are Southern and Northern varieties of Black English essentially alike, and, if not, in what ways do they differ? Only comprehensive studies of the structure of Black English in selected areas of the South can answer this question. Such studies should preferably be selected to represent different areas of the South, including the coastal, central inland, and deep South.

In addition to the description of Black English in the South, we also need comprehensive descriptive studies of nonstandard Southern white dialects. Although dialectologists have given us some indication of the phonology and lexicon of Southern white speech, the grammatical structure is lacking. As was suggested for the study of Black English in the South, several areas should be included, representing Appalachia, the deep South, and Atlantic coast regions. Descriptive studies of this type can help us resolve the controversy over the exact relationship between the speech of Southern whites and Negroes of comparable socio-economic classes.

Descriptions of the correlation of social and linguistic variables have also focused on Northern metropolitan areas. But there are important reasons why these should be extended to cover several areas of the South. Some Southern regional features have apparently only taken on social significance in the North because of their association with ethnicity and social class in the North. By contrast, there are other

features which have social significance regardless of the geographical region in the United States (a distinction between what I have called "general" and "particular" social significance). Careful studies of the social significance of linguistic variables in the South can help us sharpen our understanding of the interaction of geographical and social factors in speech. Furthermore, such studies can lead us to general conclusions about the nature of sociolinguistic variation in the United States.

Another area of great importance for descriptive studies is that of age-grading. The importance of observing age levels in speech variation was brought out by Hockett (1950) some time ago but the actual amount of descriptive study has been sparse. Recently Stewart (1968) and Dillard (1967) have suggested that an accurate picture of the nature of Black English cannot be studied apart from a description of age-grading within the Black community. Loban's (1966) longitudinal study of children in California hints at crucial age differences, but his taxonomy and linguistic orientation would be unacceptable from the viewpoint of the linguist.

Studies of age-grading should not be confused with the description of language acquisition, which is an area for descriptive studies in its own right, as we shall shortly see. Age-grade studies should start with the earliest post-acquisitional period (6-8). The age level when sensitivity to the social consequences of speech behavior starts to approximate adult norms (according to Labov (1965b:91), this is about age 14 or 15) is of extreme importance for the linguist.

The speech of teen-agers is, of course, simply one aspect of their behavioral response to the adult world which can give us invaluable information. Such studies, though, cannot be separated from peer group norms, so that such studies must concentrate on peer groups.

Acquisitional studies of nonstandard dialects are also needed for cross-cultural investigation. But such studies must be related to nonstandard norms, a condition which some acquisitional studies have not observed.[17] For example, the acquisition of f and θ by speakers of Black English must be related to the function of these units within the vernacular (e.g. /f/ in final position being the Black English adult

norm). To do otherwise can only lead to some of the fallacious conclusions that we have already discussed in Part 1 of this report. This is not to say that a comparative study of nonstandard speech patterns and certain stages of acquisition for standard English speakers should not be undertaken. In fact, we need such studies to show us the ways in which nonstandard dialects are similar and different from certain stages in language acquisition. For example, we observe that copula absence occurs in Black English and also at a certain stage of language acquisition for all children, or we observe that the f/θ contrast, one of the last phonological contrasts to be acquired by standard English speakers, is characteristic of Black English in certain positions. We need to know in precisely what ways these features function similarly and in what ways differently. Such studies must serve as the basis for disputing claims that Black English indicates a relation to retarded standard English language acquisition.

Finally, we need more data on the role of sex in language. Most laymen will readily admit to differences in speech related to sex, but few comprehensive studies have dealt with the topic (perhaps due to our failure to view the familiar as unfamiliar). The studies by Fisher (1958), Shuy, Wolfram and Riley (1967), Labov (1966) and Wolfram (1969) give evidence that this is a fruitful area for descriptive studies in the United States, but we need several exhaustive analyses showing us the exact ways in which sex differentiation conditions speech behavior across different social groups.

3. Theoretical issues. Although the explication of theoretical issues is inevitably related to descriptive studies, we may cautiously isolate several outstanding issues which current research on social dialects raises for the linguist. There are, of course, many issues which present studies are also raising for sociologists (e.g. the discreteness of social classes, definition of social roles, etc.) and/or anthropologists, but in this discussion we shall limit ourselves to those problems which deal with central issues in theoretical linguistics.

Perhaps the outstanding problem for the linguist dealing with sociolinguistic variation in language is the way in which observed linguistic variation can be accounted for in a linguistic model of description. Linguistic models of language description are all based on

discrete oppositions as opposed to gradience or probability. The question, then, is, do we adopt linguistic models to account for systematic variation (i.e. variation conditioned by social or independent linguistic variables), do we "manipulate" the data in such a way as to fit into the existing framework of linguistic descriptions, or do we describe it apart from any descriptive model of language competence -- a particular type of performance model?

Labov has suggested that regular and uniform structuring of variation is an integral part of language competence whereas DeCamp (1969:1) has insisted that Labov's gradience is an empirical observation of superficial phenomena which can be accounted for by a "combination of discrete oppositions (cf. Fourier analysis of wave phenomena) followed by curve smoothing". Despite DeCamp's dismissal of Labov's contention, one must recognize the potential that Labov's variable rule has for linguistic descriptions. Further experimentation with this concept has important implications for the assumption of categoricality in current linguistic models. With reference to current models, we must also ask if there is one current generative model (e.g. transformational versus stratificational) in which gradience can be incorporated more economically than another. Such a question may give us some indication of the explanatory adequacy of grammatical descriptions. We must also investigate to what extent descriptive models might account for other types of structured social factors conditioning language choice. Can we, for example, expect and/or demand that a linguistic model incorporate context-sensitive rules whose environment is stated in terms of extra-linguistic factors. Such types of questions that are raised by sociolinguistic investigations can cause the linguist to reexamine his assumptions concerning language as CODE and BEHAVIOR.

Another area in which current sociolinguistic research may affect theoretical models of language description concerns the extent to which a description can encompass more than an idolect. The traditional approach of the linguist is to describe the linguistic competence of a single speaker as representative of a given variety of the language. Certain attempts to account for dialect differences by the incorporation of "correspondence" type formalization have been tried (e.g. Cochrane's

attempt to formalize Weinreich's diasystem (1959), but their focus on surface realizations make such attempts descriptively inadequate.

Recently, in the work of C.J. Bailey (1968, 1969), a more rigorous attempt has been made to account for different varieties of a language from a generative view of language. Bailey has proposed that it is possible to give one underlying representation for all dialects of a given language, the difference between dialects being manifested in the applicability/non-applicability of certain rules. Bailey's "pandialectal" grammar would have rules in their least general form and their marked order, since the more general forms and the unmarked order could be predicted from the other. The first question we must investigate is the feasibility of such an approach for social dialects. And, if such an approach is justifiable, what about varieties of English where different underlying structures would be motivated on independent grounds? Does one sacrifice independent motivation for "overall" descriptive adequacy or are such varieties de facto excluded as different languages? Ultimately, future descriptive statements of social dialects which deal with this matter can give the linguist information about the nature of dialect differences with respect to the surface and underlying forms of a language.

A further area for the theoretical linguist deals with differences between several types of language situations. As was mentioned earlier, there are apparent similarities between the form used by children on certain levels of acquisition in standard English and nonstandard forms. It may also be noted that in pidginization, certain modifications in a language may arise which also show similarities to levels of acquisition. Furthermore, in language interference of certain types there is an approximation of some adaptations that take place in pidginization. Assuming (and only descriptive studies can tell us if our assumption is correct or not) that there are similarities between these many types of language "modifications," it does not appear that such similarities would be accidental. We must ask if there is something inherent within a language system which "predisposes certain types of features for modification" in situations such as acquisition, pidginization and interference. To what extent may we generalize and say that certain aspects

of a language are predisposed for modification (e.g. because of "redundancy" or "functional load")? What aspects may be universal and what ones language-specific? The relation of research to this theoretical problem may give us important clues to universal traits of social dialects with relation to linguistic structure.

In addition to the broad theoretical issues raised above, there are more specific issues which future sociolinguistic research can help answer. Several of the outstanding issues are as follows:

(1) What is the role of social factors in historical language change? What implications do they have for speeding up and retarding change and how do such processes operate? (See further answers to the problem, Labov (1966) and Anshen (1969) in bibliography.)

(2) How does dialect mixture between social dialects contrast and compare with "inherent variability within a system? Related to this is the question of how overlapping systems may operate in a speech community or within a single speaker.

(3) How does hypercorrection relate to the linguistic system? That is, to what extent can the type of hypercorrection and the extent of it be predicted on the basis of the language and social system.

(4) What can the study of social dialects tell us about receptive and productive language competence? Does this apply to all dialect differences or only certain structural categories? Is it reciprocal between social dialects?

One could go on about the general and specific implications that future research must have on current theoretical issues in linguistics. What is more important for the linguist, however, is a general approach to sociolinguistics. Sociolinguistic research could simply be understood to mean the description of correlations between linguistic and social factors, without reference to any implications that these might have for theoretical problems in linguistics. Such studies would, no doubt, have great value for a number of reasons. But for the linguist, sociolinguistic studies have greatest relevance when they are specifically designed to solve linguistic problems through an investigation of social factors.

Notes

1. This is not to say that there is unanimous agreement among anthropologists about the extent to which cultural relativity is a philosophical, descriptive or methodological prerequisite for anthropological study. For an explication of some of the controversy concerning cultural relativity, see Schmidt (1955).

2. Nida (1964:47) notes that the arbitrary character of linguistic symbols refers to: (1) the arbitrary relationship between the form of the symbol and the form of the referent, (2) the relationships between classes of symbols and classes of referents, and (3) the relationship between classes of symbols and classes of symbols.

3. One should be careful to note the distinction between "interference in conceptual development" and the Whorfian hypothesis, which maintains that language categories predetermine particular conceptualizations of the external world. In the former case a value judgment is placed on the adequacy of conceptualization, while the latter, no value judgment is made.

4. This sentence could, of course, be interpreted positively in a context such as He didn't do just nothing; he was always busy. Usually, however, there is a strong stress on nothing to indicate this intention.

5. Although the notion of deep and surface structure in modern linguistics derived from the insights of transformational-generative grammar, any generative model of language will be characterized by the recognition of this dichotomy. For example, this notion is implicit in stratificational grammar, although the series of steps (i.e. how many levels) and the mode for relating levels (how one gets from one level to another) may differ significantly from transformational-generative grammar.

6. It is interesting to note that a sample of language indices Bereiter cites as indicative of language competence (1965:199-200) have nothing to do with language. He consistently confuses the recognition of logical operations with language development.

7. The different models for describing nonstandard dialects were originally explicated by Cazden (1966).

8. By social class, I mean a group in a society whose members hold a number of distinctive statuses in common and who, through the operation of these roles associated with these statuses, develop an awareness of like traits and interests as against the unlike traits and interests of other groups (Hoebel 1958:415)

9. To say that there is a tendency toward language standardization in no way implies that there will be agreement on the establishment of one standard language in a particular national setting. There may be competing languages for standardization, or considerable disagreement concerning a chosen standard.

10. This fact does not imply that it is futile to "campaign" against the misconceptions about the linguistic structure of nonstandard dialects. Indeed, linguists can help clarify that the notion of language standardization is a social phenomenon which has nothing to do with the inherent linguistic structure of the language varieties involved.

11. The report of current research only includes articles which were brought to my attention through 1969.

12. Nonstandard dialects have, of course, always received incidental attention in prescriptive English textbooks which point out "incorrect" speech patterns to be avoided.

13. This choice is by no means accidental since most linguists agree that if there are any significant differences between Black English and Standard English, they will be found in the verb system.

14. Although Labov includes Puerto Rican speech in his title, the actual description is limited to the Puerto Ricans who are integral members of the Negro speech community.

15. This position does not preclude the possibility that historically, alternations may have been importations. It simply means that from a synchronic standpoint, fluctuation is an inherent part of the Black English system.

16. These directions, no doubt, reflect the biases of the author. However, many of these directions have been discussed with colleagues at one time or another, so that they represent more than personal preferences.

17. Only by relating it to nonstandard norms can we have some indication of actual language retardation by a small minority of lower socio-economic class children. Current studies which utilize Standard English norms of acquisition erroneously categorize a majority of these children as being linguistically retarded (a case of misconceived retardation).

References

Anshen, Frank. A sociolinguistic analysis of a sound change. Paper presented at the Linguistic Society of America, Champaign, Illinois, July, 1969.

Bailey, Beryl Loftman. Toward a new perspective in Negro English dialectology, American Speech 40, 171-177.

Bailey, C.J.N. The integration of linguistic theory: internal reconstruction and comparative method in descriptive linguistics. Working Papers in Linguistics No. 2 (1969) 85-122.

-----. Implicational scales in diachronic linguistics and dialectology, Working Papers in Linguistics No. 8 (1969) 123-137.

Baratz, Joan C. Teaching reading in the Negro school, in Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy (Eds.), Teaching Black Children to Read. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics.

Bereiter, Carl. Academic instruction and preschool children. In Corbin and Crosby (Eds.), Language programs for the disadvantaged. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965. pp. 195-203.

----- and Engelmann, Siegfried. Teaching disadvantaged children in the preschool. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bernstein, Basil. Elaborated and restricted codes: their social origins and some consequences, American Anthropologist 66:6, Part 2 (1964), 55-69

Billiard, Charles, Arnold Lazarus and Raven McDavid. Dialect features affecting the social mobility and economic opportunities of the disadvantaged in Fort Wayne, Indiana. U.S. Office of Education. Contract No. 9-E011 1969.

Bright, William. Linguistic change in some Indian caste dialects, in Charles A. Ferguson and John Gumperz (Eds.), Linguistic diversity in South Asia. Bloomington, Indiana University, 1960.

-----. Introduction: The dimensions of sociolinguistics, in William Bright (Ed.), Sociolinguistics. The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1966.

Cazden, Courtney B. Subcultural differences in child language: An interdisciplinary review. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 12 (1966), 185-219.

Chomsky, Noam. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, M.I.T. Press, 1965.

-----. Language and Mind. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968.

Cochrane, G.R. The Australian English vowels as a diasystem, Word 15 (1959), 69-88.

DeCamp, David. Toward a generative analysis of a post-Creole speech continuum. Paper presented at the Conference on Pidginization and Creolization of Langua ge, Mona, Jamaica, 1968.

-----. Toward a formal theory of sociolinguistics. Unpublished MS, 1969.

Dillard, Joey L. Age-grading in language and culture. Unpublished MS, Center for Applied Linguistics, 1967.

-----. Negro children's dialect in the inner city, The Florida FL Reporter 5 (Fall 1967), 7-10.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener, American Anthropologist 66:6, Part 2 (1964), 86-102.

-----. Sociolinguistics. Working paper no. 3, Language-Behavior Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, November 1967.

Fasold, Ralph W. A dilemma in sociolinguistic theory. Paper presented at the Linguistic Society of America, Champaign, Illinois, July, 1969.

Fischer, John L. Social influences on the choice of a linguistic variant, Word 14 (1958), 47-56.

Galvan, Mary M. and Troike, Rudolf C. The East Texas Dialect Project. Texas, University of Texas, 1968.

Garvin, Paul and Madeleine Mathiot. The urbanization of the Guarani language: a problem in language and culture, in A.F.C. Wallace (ed.), Men and Cultures; Selected Papers of the Fifth International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences. Philadelphia, Pa., University of Pennsylvania Press, 1966, 783-790.

Golden, Ruth I. Effectiveness of instructional tapes for changing regional speech. EdD dissertation, Wayne State University.

Gumperz, John J. Dialect differences and social stratification in a North Indian village, American Anthropologist 60 (1958a), 668-681.

-----. Phonological differences in three Hindi village dialects, Language 34 (1958b), 221-224.

-----. Speech variation and the study of Indian civilization, American Anthropologist 63 (1961), 976-988.

-----. Linguistic and social interaction in two communities, American Anthropologist, 66:6, Part 2 (1964), 137-153.

Havranek, Bohuslav. The functional differentiation of the standard language, in Paul L. Garvin (ed.), A Prague School Reader in Esthetics, Literary Structure, and Style. Washington, D.C., Washington Linguistics Club, #1, 1955.

Hockett, Charles F. Age-grading and linguistic continuity, Language 26 (1950), 449-457.

Henrie, Samuel N. A Study of Verb Phrases Used by Five Year Old Non-standard Negro English Speaking Children. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

Hoebel, E. Adamson. Man in the Primitive World. New York, McGraw-Hill Co., Inc., 1958.

Houston, Susan. A sociolinguistic consideration of the Black English of children in northern Florida, Language 45 (1969), 599-607.

Hurst, Charles G. Psychological correlates of dialectolalia. Washington, D.C., 1965.

Hymes, Dell H. The ethnography of speaking, in Thomas Gladwin and William C. Sturtevant (Eds.), Anthropology and human behavior. Washington, D.C., Anthropological Society of Washington, 1962.

-----. Linguistic theory and the functions of speech, to be published in proceedings of "International Days of Linguistics", Rome, 1969.

-----. Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication, American Anthropologist 66:6, Part 2 (1964), 1-34.

Kochman, Thomas. "Rapping" in the black ghetto. Trans-action, February 1969, 26-34.

Kurath, Hans. Handbook of the linguistic geography of New England. Providence: American Council of Learned Societies, 1939.

-----. Linguistic atlas of New England. Providence: American Council of Learned Societies, 1941.

-----. A word geography of the eastern United States. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1949.

Labov, William. Phonological indices to social stratification. Paper presented at the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, 1963a.

-----. The social motivation of a sound change. Word 19 (1963b), 273-309.

-----. On the mechanism of linguistic change. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics 18 (1965a), 91-114.

-----. Stages in the acquisition of standard English. In Roger W. Shuy (Ed.) Social Dialects and language learning. Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965b, PP. 77-104.

-----. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966a.

-----. Hypercorrection by the lower middle class as a factor in linguistic evaluation. In William Bright (Ed.), Sociolinguistics. The Hague: Mouton, 1966b, PP. 84-113.

-----. Contraction, deletion, and inherent variation of the English copula. Language 45 (1969a).

-----. The logic of non-standard English, Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 22 (1969b).

-----. The Study of Non-Standard English. Washington, D.C., ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics, 1969c.

-----. Cohen, Paul, Robins, Clarence and Lewis, John. A study of the non-standard English of Negro and Puerto Rican speakers in New York City. Final report. Cooperative Research Project 3288. Office of Education, 1968.

Legum, Stanley E., Williams, Clyde E., and Lee, Maureen T. Social dialects and their implications for beginning reading instruction. Inglewood, Calif. Southwest Regional Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1969.

Loban, Walter D. Problems of oral English. Champaign, Ill., National Council of Teachers of English, 1966.

Loflin, Marvin D. A teaching problem in nonstandard Negro English, English Journal 56 (1967a), 1312-1314.

-----. On the structure of the verb in a dialect of American Negro English. Report No. 26, Center for Research in Social Behavior, University of Missouri, 1967b.

-----. Negro Nonstandard and Standard English: Same or different deep structure?, Orbis 18 (1969), 74-91.

-----. On the passive in nonstandard Negro English. Journal of English as a Second Language, 4 (Spring 1969), 19-23.

McDavid, Raven I., Jr. Postvocalic r in South Carolina. A social analysis. American Speech 23 (1948), 194-203.

-----. A checklist of significant features for discriminating social dialects. In Eldonna L. Evertts (Ed.), Dimensions of dialect. Champaign, National Council of Teachers of English, 1967. PP. 7-10.

-----. Variations in standard American English. Elementary English 45 (May 1968), 561-564, 608.

----- and Austin, William M. (Eds.) Communication barriers for the culturally deprived. Cooperative Research Project 2107, Office of Education, 1966.

McKay, June Rumery. A Partial Analysis of a Variety of Nonstandard Negro English. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

Menyuk, Paula. Sentences children use. Cambridge, MIT Press, 1969.

Mitchell-Kernan, Claudia. Language Behavior in a Black Urban Community. Working Paper No. 23, Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, University of California, Berkeley, 1969.

Nida, Eugene A. Toward a Science of Translating. Leiden, E.J. Brill, 1964.

Parslow, Robert, Ries, Julie, Bruder, Mary, Wilson, Timothy and Bessko, Melina. Pittsburgh Dialect Project. University of Pittsburgh, 1968.

Pederson, Lee A. The pronunciation of English in metropolitan Chicago. Publication of the American Dialect Society No. 44, University, University of Alabama Press, 1965.

Schmidt, Paul F. Some criticisms of cultural relativism, Journal of Philosophy 52 (1955) 780-791.

Shuy, Roger W., Wolfram, Walter A. and Riley, William. Linguistic correlates of social stratification in Detroit speech. Final report, Cooperative Research Project 6-1347, U.S. Office of Education, 1967.

-----. Field techniques in an urban language study. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1968.

Skinner, D.F. Verbal Behavior. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.

Slobin, Dan I. A field manual for cross-cultural study of the acquisition of communicative competence. Berkeley, University of California.

Stewart, William A. Non-standard speech and the teaching of English. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1964.

-----. Sociolinguistic factors in the history of American Negro dialects, The Florida FL Reporter 5 (Spring 1967) 11, 22, 24, 26.

-----. Continuity and change in American Negro dialects, The Florida FL Reporter 6 (Spring 1968) 3-4, 14-16, 18.

Weinreich, Uriel. Is a structural dialectology possible? Word 10 (1954), 388-400.

-----. Languages in Contact. New York, Publication of Linguistic Circle of New York No. 1, 1953.

Wolfram, Walter A. A sociolinguistic description of Detroit Negro speech. Washington, D.C., Center for Applied Linguistics, 1969.

-----. Linguistic correlates of social differences in the Negro community. Georgetown University Monograph Series on Languages and Linguistics 22 (1969), in press.

-----. Underlying representations in Black English phonology. Paper presented to the Linguistic Society of America, Champaign, Ill., July, 1969.

Response to "Social Dialects from a Linguistic Perspective"

William J. Samarin
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada

Wolfram's virtue is that he kept to the terms of reference specified for this colloquium. A discussant is not so severely constrained. Since he cannot possibly evaluate the whole of a paper, he can approach the topic with greater freedom.

My stance is therefore entirely different from Wolfram's and, curiously enough, from that of everybody else as expressed at this meeting. In approaching the study of social dialects, I should like to hear answers to the question, "Who are we?" I do not mean "we linguists," although this is that part of the colloquium devoted to the contribution that linguistics might make to this study. What linguists, as linguists, are interested in is not for us to discuss here. (Their problems are "linguistic" ones, and there is much that one could say about what they can get out of the study of social dialects to solve these academic problems.)

When I say "we," I mean, specifically, the American people. For me, therefore, the answer to the question, "Who are we?" will be based, in part at least, on linguistic data--in defining the languages we speak and in describing who we are who speak them.

I start with an urbanized, industrialized, multi-ethnic, multilingual, and multidialectal society. That is the macrosociety. From there we work down to the microsocieties, that is, the societies that have prestige or no prestige, societies that are large or small, conspicuous or invisible to the others--but all somehow marked by the use of characteristic forms of languages. These are the "social dialects" of our nation, because, as defined by Halliday, they are found among certain socially-defined users.

What Needs to be Done

What needs to be done is to disabuse ourselves of the notion that the most interesting or most typical social dialects are those spoken by the largest of the "socially deprived" or "marginal" members of our

macrosociety, especially those who speak some form of nonstandard English. Equally worthy of investigation are the societies and the languages of indigenous Americans (the Indians), of "new Americans" (immigrants of all types), and of "old Americans" (like the Spanish-Americans, the chicanos).

If these are accepted as social dialects, to say, as Wolfram has, that nonstandard dialects have received little attention would not be entirely accurate. One need only mention the studies on the English of immigrant groups, for example; and some studies, like those of Haugen and Fishman are even sociolinguistic in nature. I would like to urge, therefore, that this literature, vast but not always of superior quality, be incorporated in the comprehensive study of American society.

What I am calling for is an examination of our "fences." In other words, what kinds of languages are used in the definition of ethnicity, of being chez soi? How is language (used here in the broadest sense) used symbolically to separate one "backyard" from another?

I shall suggest now the nature, if nothing more, of the answer to that question.

1. Wolfram deals with part of it. He discusses, from several points of view, the structural correlates or signals of social dialects. Prosodics and paralinguistics might also be mentioned (see, for example, D. Crystal). These are the linguistic markers, to use the term linguistic in a broad sense. This is like talking about the form of language.

2. There is also function in this nicely-argued dichotomy. How, in other words, is language used by our different societies? Differences in function may be as significant as--and, theoretically, even more important than--differences in form. That they are more subtle, hence less easily studied, is no reason for our ignoring them.

As a matter of fact, there is implicit recognition of functional differences in some descriptions of, for example, the Black Society. "Sounding" and "rapping" are two examples, even though they may not be the private property of our Black co-citizens. There are suggestions in the present data that Blacks and other linguistic minorities may differ significantly in characteristic uses of language. (Therefore, even if it were demonstrated that certain forms of Black English are indistinguishable from, say, "Southern White" English, we would, on

the basis of such functional differences, have to isolate two kinds of speech communities. Whether one wanted to call them "dialects" is another matter.) There is, of course, no suggestion here of any a priori inferiority of one set of functions as compared with another.

3. Such a study ought to include the investigation of inter-lingual contact. What happens when two languages confront each other at some point in time? What accommodations are made? It is inconceivable that speech is unaffected by the confrontation. (Does a Black waiter modify his speech when he serves an upper-class Black in an expensive restaurant?) There will, I believe, be gestures of exploration, feelers put out to see how the other person will receive the changes. Perhaps a diagnostic characteristic of socially inferior societies is that their speech has more fluctuation, this itself being a function of practiced accommodation.

One way to approach this topic might be with the use of the concept of stress or strain. In what way, for example, is the language, as structure, of a nonstandard speaker under strain? In what way and under what conditions is the speaker as a user of the language under strain, and how does it affect his performance? There is some evidence that a "formal situation" constitutes such a context for many people, but the data are still scanty and they have not been adequately formalized.

What I am calling for, then, is a typology of American language use. It would, of course, include information about (a) "registers" (which Halliday, again, defines as forms of speech that are correlated with language use) and (b) genres of discourse. Do all of our societies have the same kinds of registers? Are some registers and genres preferred over others? What can be said about their status and frequency of occurrence within that society?

Cooperation Needed

A sociolinguistic goal of the kind I am suggesting cannot be realized by a group of people who narrowly define themselves as "linguists." It would need the help also of linguistically sensitive anthropologists and sociologists. This is suggested by the problem of explaining why Black women, even unmarried girls, are more sensitive to linguistic differences between Black and Standard speech then men are. Shuy has discussed this

matter, and Wolfram, in his present paper, wonders if male linguistic conservatism is a symbol of masculinity among Blacks. Obviously, the isolation of cultural symbols is not within the domain of scientific linguistics as many of its practitioners define it today. And when Wolfram asks if a linguistic model should incorporate context-sensitive rules whose environment is stated in extra-linguistic factors, he must, I think, necessarily ask, "Who will define these factors for us?" In answering, "The social anthropologist or someone like him," I would only be repeating what many have said before me. Finally, we must acknowledge that our language teachers (students of "Miss Fiditch" though they often are) and students of literature may teach us something about the use of language in the United States. We would do well to follow the example of Erving Goffman, who has used novels and etiquette manuals to study the structure of human behavior.

The Consequences

The sociolinguistic study of American society (notice how I avoid saying "the study of American social dialects") from the point of view suggested here would have several consequences.

First, it would provide us with better means to evaluate the "adequacy" of American languages. Perhaps it can be demonstrated, for example, that, given the ecology of our kind of urbanized nation, a microsociety can no more afford the luxury of its own language than traditional farmers in India can refuse modern tools and fertilizers. The linguistic situation could be looked at in terms of adaptation and survival (as Hymes has suggested). For example, Spanish-Americans are at some disadvantage without an abundant literature in Spanish--unless its function be only to mark the society's discontinuity with "Anglo" society. We must therefore see Wolfram's reminder of linguistic doctrine (that "all language systems are perfectly adequate as communicative systems for the members of the social group") in its historical, not scientific, context; as a caveat against people who look down on, for example, Black speech because it is spoken by Blacks. Perhaps jet aircraft provides a better analogy than farmers: they are marvelous instruments, but they need adequate facilities for being launched.

Secondly, we might also learn that although the linguistic systems of some societies are equivalent, the people themselves show different kinds of skill in their uses. If it is clear, for example, that working class people show less skill in organizing narrative discourse, as some have claimed (Schatzman and Strauss), they might be better at writing poetry or drama, for all we know. Perhaps our measurements of linguistic skills preclude the demonstration of skills that are not favored by our middle-class, analytically-oriented society (as R. Cohen would suggest).

Thirdly, such a study might make us more sensitive to differences in the social meaning of language use. As responsible participants in our macrosociety, we must be aware of--and we must make others aware of--the social consequences of language use. This kind of information must be accessible to all Americans.

A Humanistic Point of View

The kinds of projects and problems I have mentioned in these few remarks are linguistic in nature, not only because the subject is speech but also because it is the discipline of linguistics that is most competent to study them. They are, however, something else. They are human problems. They touch on human self-identity, on aspirations, on hopes for self-fulfillment. Touching language is touching man deep inside him. This is why linguistics, when it studies social dialects, becomes humanistic. And its outcome is likewise humanistic: it leads to self-understanding, respect, and humility. Whatever might be the political and economic imperatives of a modern nation, they must not subjugate the people who make up the nation. The structure is built, after all, with blocks of humanity, and language is only its mortar.

References

Cohen, Rosalie A. 1969. Conceptual styles, culture conflict, and nonverbal tests of intelligence. American Anthropologist 71.828-56.

Crystal, David. 1970. Prosodic and paralinguistic correlates of social categories. Social Anthropology and language. (Association of Social Anthropology Monograph, 10.)

Halliday, M.A.K., Angus McIntosh, and Peter Strevens. 1964. The linguistic sciences and language teaching. London: Longmans.

Hymes, Dell H. 1961. Functions of speech: an evolutionary approach. Anthropology and education, ed. by Frederick C. Gruber. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. Reprinted in Man in adaptation: the biosocial background, ed. by Yehudi A. Cohen, 247-59. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co.

Schatzman, L. and A. Strauss. 1955. Social class and modes of communication. The American Journal of Sociology 60.329-38. Reprinted in Communication and culture, ed. by Alfred G. Smith, 442-55. New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Shuy, Roger W. Sex as a factor in sociolinguistic research. Unpublished paper presented at a meeting of the Anthropological Society of Washington.

PART II

THE CURRENT STATUS OF ORAL LANGUAGE MATERIALS

Statement of Problem

With the increased interest and concern with the culturally different student in the early and mid-sixties, there came an increased call for materials to teach standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects. Funding from federal and local governments and from private sources underwrote some materials development projects, and individuals and groups began to write materials without the assistance of special funding. Throughout the country, people were experimenting with various pedagogical approaches, and they were producing materials. But there has been no way of determining what has been done in the way of materials development.

One materials development project might have been unaware of the work of other similar groups. Schools wishing to locate materials for their own use were unaware of the products of the development projects. There does not seem to be any procedure for disseminating information about materials development. There has been some exchange of information at national meetings, and the professional journals have carried articles about aspects of teaching methodology and materials development. From time to time, one comes across a reference to a set of materials, but this is an irregular and chance event. There is no source for information about materials, either projects that are experimenting with materials or projects that are producing materials. There does not seem to be a reluctance to share ideas and materials; there seems to be no way to do this.

Without the means for sharing ideas or even of determining who might be doing what or where, many people turned out materials in isolation. The isolation was not due to a lack of awareness of the classroom situation (although this may have been true in some cases); it was due more to the ignorance of the approaches and premises of other materials writers. This isolation was further aggravated by the inability of people to obtain copies of what had already been produced. Very often a school system would turn out lessons for use within the system: the materials would be written, tried out, and distributed

throughout the system. But what about the educators in the next city or across the country who faced the same teaching problems? How could they obtain copies either for use in their classes or for study to determine what others had found worthwhile?

For the most part, materials development has been done in various parts of the country without much knowledge of other similar undertakings -- other than the knowledge that such projects have been undertaken. In such a situation it is reasonable to find some duplication of effort: much of the recent recognition of nonstandard dialects and their study has come from linguists, and it is reasonable to expect that their recommendations and descriptions might influence pedagogical strategies.

This survey was begun as an answer to this problem of not knowing what is available. We wished to locate available materials and to determine their contents and approaches to the problem of teaching oral standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects of English.

Strategies for Locating and Securing Materials

The staff of the Sociolinguistics Program at the Center for Applied Linguistics has been involved for several years in linguistic research on the language of culturally-different children and on the application of linguistic findings to pedagogical problems. Because of this involvement, we have been familiar with many of the people in the field. It is this familiarity that formed the basis for the search.

Letter-writing was the principal means of locating materials. Approximately 115 letters were sent to individuals and publishers. These were (1) people we knew in the field, (2) sources recommended by others personally or in answers to our letters, and (3) people mentioned in research reports or in articles in professional journals. Occasionally, a member of the Sociolinguistics Program staff would find a reference through personal contact at a conference or other meeting: these people also received letters. The Center for Applied Linguistics has a clearinghouse for Linguistic Research in Progress; this inventory was also combed for potential sources. Of the letters sent, about 70 brought responses. The responses were of several kinds: (1) statements that no materials development was in progress or had been done, (2) enclosures of research

reports (often dealing with materials development), and (3) enclosures of materials or information where the materials could be obtained. There were relatively few responses of the last type, but most of these people were very cooperative in providing samples of their materials for our inventory.

One other way of uncovering materials was used: the book displays at the convention of the National Council of Teachers of English. It was reasoned that, if any materials were available commercially, the commercial distributor or publishers would show them at this national meeting of English teachers from public and private schools and from all levels from pre-school to graduate programs. In order to cover the book displays, we spent one-half of a day going to every display booth that might conceivably yield materials of the type we were trying to locate. This part of the search yielded only 3 sets of materials. The publishers were very cooperative in furnishing us copies of the materials.[1]

This survey may suffer from the same underlying weakness that prompted the search: how do we know when we have exhausted the field? Might we not turn up yet another set of materials tomorrow? This is a difficult problem, and, although we think that we have covered the field, there is always the possibility of coming across one more set of materials.

The Object of the Search (the kinds of materials)

This survey includes materials to teach standard English to speakers of nonstandard dialects of English. There is no implication that it is not important to determine what has been done in other areas of English pedagogy, but it is necessary to delimit an area. The search has been restricted to materials that are:

1. Intended to teach oral standard English. One may also wish to do a survey of the materials to teach reading to speakers of nonstandard dialects (another survey being done at the Center for Applied Linguistics will include such materials), but it does not come under the cover of this particular research.

2. Directed to native speakers of English. One may and should be concerned with culturally different students who do not speak English of any kind, but this area is not covered in this survey. (There is no intention to open the controversial area of "degree of difference"; that is, the amount of understanding between a speaker of a nonstandard dialect of English and a speaker of standard English.)

Of the materials included in our inventory, the objective is usually clear. It is not always so clear what the student population is. In all cases, the authors' statements, when available, have been used in making the above two discriminations. When not available, we have made the decisions on the basis of whatever clues we could discover.

The inventory of materials is shown in Appendix I. A preliminary inventory (April 1, 1970) was sent out to the authors included, so that they would have the opportunity to review the classification and correct the brief annotations. About three-fourths responded; the changes have been incorporated in the listing.[2]

Critique

It is difficult to determine the effectiveness of a teaching program from reading it; a trial with students is necessary. We cannot examine the materials in our inventory and state with precise accuracy which are good and which are not. What we can do is describe what has been done in materials development: Where are we now that many different people have set about developing materials to teach standard English? What are the linguistic and pedagogical premises that have been incorporated into the materials? Since most of the materials we have gathered have gone beyond the first experimental draft, it is reasonable to assume that the developers have been satisfied with them to a certain degree. It might be more to the point to ask the following questions: With what have the materials developers become satisfied? What have they found to be useful with teachers and students? It is to answer these questions that we undertook the work described below.

In thinking about procedures for describing the materials, we decided that we would need an objective way of guiding our examination. It would not be fruitful to examine the materials to see what we could find. It seemed better to structure the examination in order to determine what had been done, without the danger of introducing extraneous elements of personal valuation. We were interested in having an instrument that would guide examination. The items or questions in the instrument should be such that no guessing or intuiting would be necessary in applying the structured form to the program under examination. A question we always had in mind was: What can we reasonably look for in a set of materials

so that presence, absence or description could be noted without the addition of subjective interpretation by the describer?

In order to create this instrument, several meetings of consultants were held at the Center for Applied Linguistics. The first meeting was held on April 25, 1970. The purpose of this meeting was to determine what types of information should be and could be gotten from a set of materials. The participants were:

1. Mary Galvan, Texas Education Agency
2. Douglass Gordon, Washington, D.C. public schools
3. Jane Torrey, Department of Psychology, Connecticut College
4. Ronald Wardhaugh, English Language Institute, University of Michigan
5. Irwin Feigenbaum, Sociolinguistics Program, Center for Applied Linguistics

The meeting was relatively informal, with discussion of the types of information to be looked for and of specific questions that should be asked.

The second meeting was held on April 30. This meeting had only three people. Its purpose was to order the elements that had come from the meeting of April 25. The participants were:

1. Catherine Garvey, The Center for Study of Social Organization of Schools, The Johns Hopkins University
2. Patricia Johansen, Psycholinguistics Program, Center for Applied Linguistics
3. Irwin Feigenbaum, Sociolinguistics Program, Center for Applied Linguistics

The third meeting was intended as a trial of the tentative outline/questionnaire that was organized at the meeting of April 30. A six-page document had been turned out, and it seemed to be inclusive, but, in order to determine how well it covered the ground and how easy it was to use and how well it provided for guided, objective examination of a set of materials, the third meeting was held. This meeting was held on May 9. The participants were:

1. Peggy Booth, Language in Education Program, Center for Applied Linguistics
2. Doris Gillespie, Pontiac, Michigan Board of Education

3. Douglass Gordon, Washington, D.C. public schools
4. Thelma Montgomery, Washington, D.C. public schools
5. Jane Torrey, Department of Psychology, Connecticut College
6. Irwin Feigenbaum, Sociolinguistics Program, Center for Applied Linguistics

On May 9, the questionnaire/outline was tried two ways. First, each of the participants examined one set of materials from our inventory, using the outline/questionnaire for guidance. They were to look at the document in order to determine (1) whether the items could be answered from the materials they had, without guessing; (2) to decide whether the document told them all they wanted to know about the set; and (3) whether the document provided for a good exposition of the materials. This activity occupied about half of the day. The second part of the day was spent in examining the document, with each of the participants using the same set of materials. For this purpose, we had secured six copies of one of the sets of materials (essentially a book); each of the six participants had one copy. We were interested in determining how uniform the responses would be with six people using the outline/questionnaire on the same program. At the end of this session, we were satisfied that our document was useable as a tool to guide the examination and description of a teaching program[3].

One could apply the document to each of the programs we had secured (some of the programs would have to be excluded since the samples we have are so scant that it would be unfair and unrevealing to subject them to the scrutiny of the document). It is not our intention to give such a detailed description of the materials we have gathered. The document will be used as a framework for discussing the general field of materials to teach standard English, that is, where we now are. The document will, however, be applied to two of the more typical sets to reveal in some detail the direction that materials development has taken[4].

The Outline/Questionnaire

The document has six main divisions[5]. They are:

1. Administration
2. Objectives, Tests, Evaluation
3. Content

4. Pedagogy
5. Quality control
6. Affect

These six divisions provide a full description of a course of study. Whether a program consists of a single book for the teacher or contains student books and sophisticated audio-visual aids, it can be examined from these six viewpoints. There is no implication that any question answered "no" or "no information available" indicates that the program is inferior: the objectives will have influenced the development of the program. However, with the instrument one can more readily see the features of a program in the larger context of a fuller instructional program.

Overlap occurs. There did not seem to be any convenient way to avoid overlap since the same question may bear on more than one area in describing a set of materials. Although the document is not used as a means of exhaustively describing all the materials in our inventory, it could be used in that way, and, in using it that way, one could have a reasonable description of any given program seen from one or several of the six areas.

Administration. The first of the six sections of the outline/questionnaire is called "administration"; it is meant to provide information about the more mechanical aspects of use of the program. It is divided into three parts: materials; students and teacher; and classroom.

Under "materials", there is a description of the entire instructional program. This is called the "package". Our description is limited in that we have been able to discuss only what we have received or what we know exists in the package. Often there is a clear statement of the components; other times we have had to restrict ourselves to the materials on hand.

The most common form of package is the teacher's manual. Approximately half of the packages consist of only a manual. Apparently there is the feeling that, since the instruction is in oral language, written material for the students is not necessary or is unwanted. The two elementary-level packages that do include student books provide essentially pictures for the students. Three of the elementary-level

packages include tapes: two have audio tapes, and one has teletapes. On the secondary level, two packages have student books. One of these is a program which covers both reading and oral skill development, and it is reasonable to expect student books. The other package has a student workbook for use with the accompanying tapes. This package and one other have audio tapes. Two of the packages on the adult level have audio tapes with accompanying student books; one package has records.

Most of the programs have been produced by special materials development groups working in or closely with a school system. A few of them have been produced by individuals working alone, that is, not as part of a special materials development effort. Geograpnically, the programs come from areas from Hawaii to Florida, and it is not unexpected that most of the projects were located in large metropolitan areas. Approximately one-third of the programs are available commercially. Many of the programs were turned out by a particular school system for use in the system, without any thought to use outside the system. For this reason, they are very difficult to obtain even after they have been located. The developers come from a wide range of backgrounds: English-as-a-second language, speech, linguistics, psychology, and education.

The materials we have gathered fall very conveniently into the three groups shown in the listing in Appendix I. With the exception of the materials produced by the Philadelphia School System (which covers the range from early elementary school through the twelfth grade), the programs group at the beginning of each of the three divisions of primary, secondary, and adult; that is, the primary materials are for students in kindergarten, in kindergarten and first grade, in kindergarten through third grade, in kindergarten through fourth grade, or for students who are five to seven years old. Several of the programs do not specify grade or age; one simply indicates "primary." The secondary materials are for students in grades seven and eight (one of these programs states a reading level of fourth to fifth grade -- the only one to state reading level), in grades seven and ten, or in grades seven through twelve. The adult level materials are for beginning college students or for use in special training programs like business education.

The designation of student population by dialect shows the same types of difficulty that have faced the dialectologist in the area of sociolinguistics. There are problems of distinguishing standard and nonstandard dialects, designating features of the dialects, and determining which standard and nonstandard dialects fall together regionally or by linguistic features. Four of the programs are for students who speak one of the nonstandard dialects of English; the implication is that, regardless of the nonstandard dialect, the materials are applicable. Two of the programs are for students who speak a local nonstandard dialect; one is for students who use the uneducated speech of a particular region. One program is for students who habitually use linguistic features outside the range of standard usage. One program is for speakers of the Hawaii Islands Dialect, and five programs are designed for black students who speak dialects that are not standard. Few of the programs are meant for combined groups of students who speak nonstandard dialects of English and students who do not speak English. One such program has books for students whose native language is not English and students who speak nonstandard dialects of English. This same program has a book for Spanish-background children who have limited control of standard English (which can be construed to cover both groups). One program is for students who do not speak English or speak dialects that offer significant structural competition with standard English[6]. This program and one that is for students whose native dialects differ more or less significantly from standard English also present some problems of linguistic definition. One program that is for non-English speaking students claims that it can be used to advantage with students who speak nonstandard dialects. It is best not to comment further on the relative appropriateness or correctness of statements about the students' dialects. It is natural that the materials developers should encounter the same types of trouble that dialectologists have faced in their work.

Most of the programs describe the entering student's performance linguistically. Several of the materials for primary school students are also concerned with cognitive development as it is related to the students' use of English. It is interesting to note that it is easy to determine the academic field of the materials developers from the

entering student performance they describe. Those from the field of speech are concerned with pronunciation and production of speech sounds; those from the field of linguistics are concerned with phonological and grammatical patterns; and those who have worked with young children in the early primary grades are also concerned with language as it is related to cognitive processes. This is not to imply that there are firm, clear lines between all the materials, but it is interesting to note the different biases of the developers. All the materials seem to assume that all the students will go through the program. Only one indicates that any kind of diagnosis of problem areas is needed before the students are put into the program. This program describes a very informal way that teachers can determine where the students are linguistically. One program, the Job Corps, has included a formalized testing for diagnosis of student problems (if a student passes a part of the test, he need not go through the corresponding part of the program).

Of the programs gathered, only one states special competencies needed by the teacher: the teacher is expected to know the aural-oral methodology of teaching foreign languages. Two programs include written material addressed to the teacher. This material discusses various techniques for teaching, especially the methodology of teaching English as a second language.

The programs differ in the amount of control they exert over the teacher's role in the instruction. The range is from extreme control (in those programs that are entirely or partially self-instructional), in which the teacher has no options in varying the instruction, through moderate, in which the materials outline step-by-step presentations (or suggestions for presentations) but leave room for teacher-initiated modification to meet the needs of the class to little control, in which the teacher creates the activities from statements of objectives and suggestions. About half of the programs contain lists of source books for further reading and study; most of these are only a few pages long.

Approximately half of the programs tell how much time is provided in the instruction. This is done several different ways. One common way is to state how many lessons to complete in a period of time, such as a week. Another way is to say that the entire program will take a

given period of time, such as a semester. A third way is to state that each lesson takes a given length of time and that so much time should be devoted to the instruction per period or day.

Most of the programs rely on teacher-student interaction for the instruction. As might be expected, none of the materials for primary-school children is self-instructional. One set for secondary students has a partially self-instructional presentation. But, on the adult level, over half of the programs include self-instruction or self-administration as all or as a principal part of the learning.

The type of interaction with the materials will influence the size of the groups for instruction. The self-instructional packages can be used with individuals while the teaching that is teacher-student based can be used with the entire class or with selected groups. About half of the programs do not mention the problem of integrating the instruction into the rest of the curriculum. Of the few that do discuss this problem, several different approaches are suggested. One is to call the students' attention to the difference between what they have said (in another part of the school day) and the way it is said in standard English. Another way is to work in stories, poems, and songs in which appear the features that were emphasized in the language instruction. Two of the programs suggest activities like talks or research work in which the newly acquired skills can be practiced. In general, the ways to reinforce the instruction and to provide carryover are left to the creativity of the classroom teacher.

Objectives, Tests, Evaluation. The second section of the outline/questionnaire includes the information about the accomplishment of the instructional goals. The first of the three sub-groupings provides information about the objectives of the instruction and how they are stated. The second sub-grouping includes information about tests to determine students' entering proficiency and ending proficiency. The third sub-grouping provides information about the trial use of the program, that is, how successful it has been in early trials.

Most of the materials to teach standard English state an objective; some state several objectives. The statements vary from very specific

to relatively vague: one program has as an objective that the student become sensitive to the standard patterns to the degree that he recognizes them in comparison to his own and develops the facility of using them on demand; another program wishes to provide the children with an overall feeling for language patterns. Most of the statements are found in introductory material addressed to the teacher; that is, the overall goals are not included for the students. The most specific goals, those for each lesson or unit for example, are often listed in the student version, too. Some of the materials include statements of overall goals for the students. This is more often true in the programs for older students.

All of the materials for secondary students and adults which do specify goals, specify them in terms of acquisition of language skills: however the statements are put, they are concerned with the student's acquisition of the standard language that is necessary for school or business. About half of the materials developed for primary school students also stay with specifically linguistic statements; the rest combine linguistic goals with development of concepts or other closely related areas. Sometimes it is not clear simply from the statements in the book what is to be learned; for example, what is to be learned from a program in which there is instruction in the type of language that is needed in the school setting? Is this a matter of substituting standard forms for the nonstandard forms the students have mastered or is it a matter of teaching how to put logical statements? Several of the programs are concerned with remediation of speech deficiencies.

One program wishes to introduce verbal activities coordinated with motor, dramatic, and visual skills. Another is concerned with making up for the lack of stimulation that the child has faced at home; this methodology involves bombarding the students with stimulation needed for developing language skills. When a program combines linguistic and other goals, it is not clear whether this implies that the two must go together; that is, whether it is necessary to combine concept development in conjunction with the acquisition of standard English. The question of the interconnection between concept development and development of skill in standard English can be seen in an interesting light: none of the materials for older students provides for concept development even to the

extent of remedying whatever deficiencies the students may have retained by dint of not having learned standard English in the early years of their education.

Only a few of the materials give any rationale, the reasoning that led to the particular approach they have employed. The programs that see the students' lack of stimulation as the cause of their problems recommend bombardment. A program on the secondary level maintains that, in order for the students to become speakers of standard English in an efficient manner, a structured, sequenced approach is needed. Often the rationale is implicit in the statement of the overall goals in so far as that statement of goals indicates the peculiar outlook of the materials developers: the outlook will come from the training of the developers and will influence the way that they look at the problem and the way that they see it is to be handled.

Most of the statements of objectives are not phrased so that measurement of attainment can be easily achieved. On the other hand, the measurement of attainment is much easier in those programs that state objectives for individual units or lessons, and the problem of determining objectives is not so difficult in those few programs that include tests in the package. Approximately one-third of the programs include some testing, but, with the exception of the Job Corps program, very little guidance is given for determining entering achievement of the students. Most of the testing included in the packages is in the form of tests for progress through the program. One program has testing associated with the final criteria for training in secretarial skills: the evaluation of mastery of specific portions of the language instruction is not included, but the test includes a job interview in which there is an evaluation of the trainee's English.

It seems that those materials that depend almost entirely on pattern practice techniques have no testing, although it is clear from most of them what their goals are. The self-instructional programs include progress testing, but one of them does not allow the students to determine their own progress; the teacher must mark the progress tests. By far, the Job Corps has the most comprehensive testing of all the programs.

About one-third of the programs do not mention a trial of any kind. All the others indicate some sort of trial of the materials either in

the present form or in a different, earlier version. About half of this number do not mention the existence of any report. Only one of the more easily obtainable packages mentions the existence of a report of an earlier trial. The statement of version of the materials is found in only a small number of the programs. Since many of the materials development projects operated for a limited time and since the object of the projects was to turn out a set of materials for a particular school population, the existence of more than one version was not foreseen. However, that the materials are available at all must indicate that the developers were somewhat satisfied with the product. With the exception of experimental lesson materials like the Torrey materials (which are not generally available and were not meant to be), all the other programs have had some use with more than a few students.

Five of the programs had provisions for feedback included in the workings of the instructional situation in which they were developed or tried. One of them was tried by a regional educational laboratory; the others were tried by the local school division or system involved in the development of the materials. One set of materials includes a form for the teacher to fill out to suggest changes and to give reactions. Another set had invited student reactions to the materials. This was a set for use with adult students, but one wishes that this had been done with almost all the materials developed, even those developed for use with primary school students.

Content. This section of the questionnaire/outline provides information about the content of the programs. The questions involve the material that will be presented to the students as part of the learning tasks. A general indication of the contents of the programs can also be observed in those questions dealing with their administration, but in such cases the statements were more general. Under the contents, we are interested in getting at the specific aspects of the material to face the students. Although it might be possible to list exhaustively all the features and the contents of the programs, we have decided not to do this but instead to indicate the types of content material.

This section is divided into two parts, dealing with the two major subdivisions of content: the linguistic content and the nonlinguistic

content. Although our principal interest is with the linguistic content, it is important to consider the other content since it will influence the overall shape of the program. The linguistic section gets at the features that are taught to the students and also gets at the sociolinguistic content of the instruction. The nonlinguistic section includes the nonlinguistic content to be taught and the vehicle for presenting the instruction.

Three programs are concerned with teaching aspects of pronunciation, usage or grammar, and vocabulary. All the other programs restrict themselves to dealing with only two or one of these three areas. Of the three programs, two are also designed for use with primary students who do not speak English at all. The third is a college-level speech course. One primary course deals with "all the sounds of American English" and the vocabulary needed for successful school work. About nine of the courses deal with pronunciation and grammar; five with grammar only; four with pronunciation alone.

Over half of the programs do not mention how the features of the programs were selected for inclusion. No source of information is given. Three of the programs have relied on the advice of linguists. One of the programs was developed by a linguist and it is reasonable to assume that he was responsible for the selection of features for his program. Two other programs relied on lists and guides furnished by linguists who were not specifically consultants to the materials development; that is, the developers located lists in published documents that indicated differences between dialects. One program indicated that a group of professional people was used in judging samples of speech, but there is no indication of how the judges' ratings were interpreted into features to be taught. The program to teach all the sounds of English says that more time is spent on the troublesome ones. Similarly, another program has selected "'social markers' to which unfavorable evaluative connotations are often attached." This program has grouped the features to be taught according to suggested groupings made by two linguists. The Hawaii program included the doing of a contrastive analysis which was utilized in the laying out of the features to be taught. Two programs, those developed in Chicago and Pittsburgh, tell in detail how

decisions were made in selecting features to be taught. One program treats the features of high frequency of occurrence, but we are not told whether frequency is the only criterion utilized.

None of the programs indicates which oral styles are employed. We do not know whether this means that the authors were not aware of the variations of oral styles and the various styles of written English or whether this is simply an oversight in constructing the prefatory material to the teacher's manuals. This is more likely an oversight.

Almost all the programs state that they are dealing with standard English and nonstandard English in terms of appropriateness of dialect varying with the particular context in which the dialect is used. The actual wording varies from "appropriate" dialects (which is the most common terminology) to "alternate" way of speaking to the "bi-dialectal" approach. One primary program calls the children's dialect an inadequate verbal symbol system. Two adult programs treat the dialect as <u>incorrect</u> (as opposed to standard English, which is <u>correct</u>). One of these two programs has introductory statements which indicate that the authors were aware of the possibility of a second-dialect approach, but instead they decided to adopt a remediation approach (for reasons that are explained in the report).

About half of the primary programs also wish to deal with expanding the children's concepts. One adult program is part of a larger program to teach business skills, and these other skills are interwoven with the language work. One other program, on the college-level, is also concerned with teaching communication techniques; this is part of a speech course for entering college freshmen.

Most of the programs have no special vehicle for the instruction. From lesson to lesson, the subject matter changes, but usually stays in the general range of school activities and home life, things with which the students are generally familiar. Four of the primary programs rely heavily on games and songs to carry the instruction although the subject matter in these programs is also familiar. One program, which is multisensory, relies on student participation in activities for reinforcement of the language materials that the students have learned, but the types of activities are also of the "general" type. One primary program relies on a continuing conversation with characters on the tapes as the theme

throughout the instruction. Another primary program, which includes teletapes, has the same character appear throughout the lessons. One secondary series relies on a science-fiction story that continues throughout the book as a unifying theme. And the course in business education uses this type of training to furnish a continuing theme.

Pedagogy. This section of the outline/questionnaire is meant to provide information about the pedagogical strategies used in teaching standard English. The two main divisions are "overall approach," which provides a general description of the instruction, and "specific learning activities," which provides descriptions of some of the activities used in the instruction. These activities are grouped by type in the second division where they had been listed by typical order or by prominence in the first division. The third division of this section of the outline/questionnaire provides information about the pedagogical uses of the students' dialect. Although it is not comparable in importance to the other two divisions, it is worthwhile singling out this aspect of the instruction for special consideration since it is in this area that we find one of the main differences between other types of language instruction and second-dialect work.

Under the section called "overall approach", two types of information are provided: the instructional methodology itself and how the mastery is to be carried over outside the instruction. On the elementary level about one-third of the programs restrict their activities to audio-lingual methodology; that is, pattern practice with repetition. Of the others, two programs use some audio-lingual methodology combined with group games and other activities; two use repetition work combined with group games and activities; and two use language development and verbalization activities. Although this division may seem arbitrarily to divide up the types of instruction, it is important to remember that the objectives of some of these programs are quite different, and, since the objectives will influence the choice of type of instruction, quite often the instructional methodology found is the expected one.

On the secondary level, about three-fourths of the programs rely entirely on pattern practice work. In this respect, many of the programs look very much alike. The few programs that do not rely entirely on pattern practice use it quite extensively although they say that they

have adapted it to this different situation. One of this latter-type of program includes instruction in reading and composition as well as in oral standard English, and the types of instructional strategies are numerous. One other program has many varied drills and exercises but they all are directed to oral work.

On the adult level, it is possible to divide the programs into two groups, the programs for academically oriented students and those for non-academic pupils. The instruction for academic programs relies quite heavily on pattern-practice work while the others bring in other types of exercises, often because the instruction is part of a larger instructional program.

Very few of the programs have any provision for carryover outside the context of instruction. This is not meant to include the brief statements in introductory material to teachers which indicate that some outside work might be done or is advisable. This section provides information about specific activities that help in that carryover. Two of the elementary programs have specific activities, and another one suggests ways of incorporating some of the instructional-type strategies into other parts of the school work. There is a series of enrichment activities that involve field trips and other types of activities, and one program has "Take-Off Ideas" which provide for integration of the instruction in the rest of the school work.

Only one of the secondary programs has a provision for carryover. This consists of topics for "independent research." Since this program has instruction on written as well as oral English, this type of outside work fits well into the pedagogy. None of the adult programs has specific provision for carryover, although again it is worthwhile considering the programs as they fit into the setting of the instructional program. A program that is already well integrated into a larger instructional program may not need specific, planned carryover. So, in stating that a program for business English does not have provisions for carryover may not have the same implications as stating that a secondary-level program based on pattern practice has no provision for carryover.

Under the topic, "overall approach," we are also interested in the adaptation of the program for use with different types of students.

Of course, every program can be adapted through the teacher's varying of presentation: she can give the slower students more opportunity to respond, and she can skip over sections or repeat sections that the students find difficult. But this is not what is meant here by the term "adaptation." We mean to determine if the program itself has provided for differences in students. Self-instructional programs have this type of adaptation built into their structure. There are three self-instructional programs, one on the secondary level and two on the adult level. By self-instructional, we do not mean programs that could be used without a teacher's supervision; we mean programs that are designed to be used without a teacher's supervision during all or most of the instruction. Many of the programs could be used without a teacher but they were not developed specifically for this type of use.

Over three-fourths of the elementary programs have no specific provision for adaptation. Two that do, have additional activities that call for student verbalization and activities that take off from activities taught in the lessons. The only secondary program with provision for adaptation is a self-instructional program, and similarly for the adult level.

The second section is "specific learning activities". This section provides information about the types of exercises and activities in the instruction. The three divisions describe the type of interaction between the materials and the student. In the first type, the student is not called on to make any specific response to the teaching; this might involve stories that are read for interest. The second type requires the student to interact with the teaching; here the stimulus calls for a student response. This is the most frequent type of interaction in the programs reviewed. The third type involves the student's initiation of the language activity; this may involve student speeches or role-playing.

About half of the programs have interaction of the second type only. This usually consists of pattern practice exercises in which the material presents a stimulus and the student is to respond. In the materials reviewed, interaction of the first type consisted of taped stories to listen to, reading passages, and, in one case, listening to outside

visitors who came to class as part of the "enrichment" aspect of the instructional program. The interaction of the third type consists mostly of question-and-answer activities, discussions, and games in which there is no interference from the materials or the teaching (the students have the opportunity to practice without intrusion). The proportion of time spent on each type of interaction in a particular program and the types of exercises and other activities used will provide a clear picture of the program.

Only five of the programs have made overt use of the students' dialect; this is supposing that all the developers had some notion of the features to be taught in the materials, whether gained from a formal contrastive study or from the impressions of the writers from their own and the teachers' observations in classes. The five made use of the dialect in some other way(s) in the instruction. None of the programs seems to have used dialect for interest only although it is possible to assume that its presence in the instruction will prove interesting to some of the students. All five of the programs used the dialect in contrasting standard English and the student's performance. They included same/different drills, identification drills and one has drills in which the student is to edit what is presented to make it conform to standard English. Only two of the programs call for student generation of nonstandard English, one of these is for elementary school children and the other for secondary level students. Both of these programs have exercises in which the student is called on to "translate" from one dialect to the other, and the secondary-level program includes several other types of activities in which the student is called on to produce the nonstandard dialect.

Quality Control and Affect. The fifth and sixth sections of the document are called "quality control" and "affect," respectively. In examining a program systematically and thoroughly, it would be necessary to consider these two aspects, but they have not been included here because the considerations they include are more revealing in a program-specific description than they would be in a discussion of what has been done generally in the way of materials development. They are included in the two descriptions of programs included in Appendix III.

In quality control, we are concerned with the physical design of the components of the program and with the accuracy of the contents. This concern covers both the main components and the audio-visual aids that may be included in the program either as an integral part or as an option.

The section called "affect" concerns the emotional context of the instruction that the materials help to create. Since we are dealing with a difficult aspect of education, one in which much emotional conflict is possible, it is especially important to be aware of the affectual aura that the materials create and reinforce. The program can affect the emotional setting of the instruction through material addressed to the teacher (material which the students do not see) about the students and about the way to conduct the instruction and through material addressed to the student (material included in the actual instruction). It may be difficult to determine whether the affect is a good one or a bad one by finding the answers to the questions asked in this last section of the questionnaire/outline, but we feel that this section will point out the areas in which that affect acts to influence the instruction.

Notes

1. Although only three sets of materials were found at the NCTE Convention, many of the publishers' representatives expressed a desire to find such materials to publish themselves. It is also interesting to note that two commercial producers of materials to teach standard English did not show their materials at the convention.

2. One author decided to withdraw his materials because he no longer wished to claim that they were useful for second-dialect instruction as well as English-as-a-second-language.

3. The document is included in Appendix II.

4. These descriptions are included in Appendix III.

5. See Appendix II for the complete document.

6. In a later version of the program, the authors withdrew the statement about nonstandard dialects. This program is not shown in Appendix I.

PART III

THE CURRENT STATUS OF URBAN LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAMS

To survey the current college/university based resources for training of personnel, i.e. teachers, researchers, materials developers, etc. in the field of urban language, questionnaires (see Appendix A) were sent to chairmen of departments of English, Linguistics, Sociology, Speech, and Education, as well as to selected research centers. The basic sample consisted of 2,640 college/university departments/programs broken down in the following way:

1426 English Department Chairmen, as listed in the 1969 PMLA Directory;

821 Education Department/School/College Chairmen as listed in the 1969 Director of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education;

188 Sociology Department Chairmen, as obtained from the American Sociological Association. Only graduate Departments of Sociology were surveyed;

91 Speech/Speech Pathology/Communications Department Chairmen, as supplied by the American Speech & Hearing Association;

64 Linguistics Department Chairmen, as selected from University Resources in the United States and Canada for the Study of Linguistics: 1969-1970. A major criterion for selection was the availability of courses in sociolinguistics, dialectology, or American English;

50 Selected research centers, or individuals teaching or doing research, who would probably not have received a questionnaire through the above mailing.

Of the 2,640 questionnaires, 375 were returned, representing 342 schools: 155 English, 111 Education, 36 Linguistics, 45 Sociology, 23 Speech and 5 Special. Of the number returned, 256 were either blank or offered no courses which in anyway touched upon urban language situations, and 13 universities reported no present programs or courses, but indicated that plans were being made for offerings in the near future. The following table indicates the complete breakdown according to department.

Table 1

Returned Questionnaires by Departments

	Total Mailed	Total Returned	Degree Program or Courses	No Offering	Research or Special Project	Future
English	1,426	155	38	112	1	4
Education	821	111	19	89	-	3
Linguistics	64	36	25	6	-	5
Sociology/ Anthropology	188	45	8	35	1	1
Speech	91	23	8	14	1	-
Special	50	5	3	-	2	-
Totals	2,640	375	101	256	5	13

The returned questionnaires which indicated some kind of urban language offering divided into three major categories: 1. Universities with degree programs in sociolinguistics, urban/social dialects, urban education, etc.; 2. Universities with no degree programs, but two or more courses devoted wholly or largely to sociolinguistics/urban dialect; 3. Universities with no substantial program in sociolinguistics, which offer one or more courses dealing in whole or in part with urban language. Categories 1 and 3 subdivide further, and a fourth category is that of the research center which offers no courses, but research/ program development capabilities.

Analysis of Questionnaires

COURSES

Category 1: Degree Programs

Eighteen of the universities responding to the questionnaire offer degree programs in sociolinguistics, urban/social dialects or urban education, under the auspices of Linguistics, English or Education Departments.

A. Education Degrees. Half of the eighteen are education programs offering a concentration in teaching in the inner city. Attention to the problem of ghetto language varies from modest to zero, with only three schools offering even one course devoted largely to Urban/Black English: Marygrove College, Detroit (M.Ed. in Ethno-Urban Culture), offers "Linguistics for the Urban Teacher"; Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles (M.S.Ed., with emphasis on Urban Education), "Language in the Inner City," two sections, one with emphasis on Mexican-Americans, the second on other minority groups; Fordham University at Lincoln Center, New York (Ed.D. in Urban Education), "Black Studies," with major attention to language patterns and problems.

At the lower end of the spectrum is the California State College, Los Angeles, program (M.A. in Education with Special Interest in Urban Education) which recommends but does not require, a course in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, presumably designed for the Spanish-speaking school population, with little or no attention to the native non-standard English speaker. (It is not that the anticipated urban school population is entirely non-Black; a suggested course in the California State program is the history of Sub-Saharan Africa!)

An outstanding example of a training program which neglects entirely the language component of education in the ghetto is Cooperative Urban Teacher Education (CUTE), a project of the Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, supported in part by funds from the U.S. Office of Education. CUTE is designed "to prepare teachers for the often traumatic experience of inner-city teaching" [Innovation in the Inner City, p.v.], unfortunately with no treatment of inner-city English. It should be noted that CUTE is not of itself a degree program and is noted here in

addition to the eighteen degree programs, as an example of a substantial urban education offering with no attention to urban English. There are probably many more such urban education programs offered through education departments or cooperatives. The chairman of the English Department of New York State University College at Genesco noted with dismay that the relevant courses from his department ("English as a Second Language," "American Dialects") are "not required or even recommended" for the degree programs in urban education.

Between these extremes are education degree programs with some attention to Urban/Black English in general courses on regional and social variations of English, the teaching of English, or communication skills:

Arizona State University, Tempe (M.A. in Special Education);

Chicago State College, Chicago (M.S. in Education: Teaching Socially Disadvantaged Children);

Boston University School of Education, Boston (Ed.M., Ed.D. in Urban Education);

Towson State College, Baltimore (M.A. in Urban Education).

B. Sociolinguistics/Urban Dialects Degrees. The other nine universities reporting, offer a degree (or concentration) in sociolinguistics or urban dialects. The emphasis may be theoretical, with courses for the scholar interested in the problems of languages and dialects in contact within a society, or practical, designed for the teacher of standard English to speakers of other dialects of English. Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., is an example of a program with a stress on the theoretical. The following courses are offered in the program leading to the Ph.D. in Linguistics, with a major in Sociolinguistics:

Introduction to Sociolinguistics I and II: A survey of topics in the scientific study of languages and dialects in their relation to the rules and status of their speakers.

Field Methods in Sociolinguistics I and II: Procedures for acquiring and analyzing sociolinguistic data with emphasis on actual fieldwork.

Ethnography of Communication: Study of the interaction of form and function in language usage. Relations between setting,

participants, topics, and functions of interactions are considered.

Bilingualism: Linguistic description of bilingual situations and informants.

Pidgins and Creoles: Study of the general aspects of language pidginization and creolization with special descriptive attention to select creoles and pidgins.

Cultural Anthropology: Introduction to the research assumptions, concepts and understandings of the nature of culture.

Sociolinguistics and Education: An investigation of the areas of education in which sociolinguistic research is applicable and promising, from pre-school through adult education.

Dialect Geography: A survey of research in regional dialects with particular focus on studies in this country.

Language and Social Variation: The analysis of a social class dialect as an example of variation in language along the social dimension.

Language Planning and Standardization: The study of overt official attempts to influence language shift and language change.

Individual Graduate Research: For qualified students doing individual research under the direction of a staff member. Approval of the Dean of Graduate School is required.

Seminar in Sociolinguistics: Intensive study of sociolinguistic topics such as Variability in Language, Social Factors in Language Change, etc. Topics will vary from year to year.

A practical curriculum leading to the M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language (or Dialect) is offered through the English Department, University of California at Los Angeles. The emphasis here is on teaching methodology and urban dialects of the United States.

Linguistics and Minority Dialects: A survey of the main features of vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation which distinguish the usage of Afro-American and Spanish-American speakers of English, and their historical origins.

Afro-American English: A detailed study, involving the analysis of tapes and documents, of the characteristics of urban Afro-American speech and writing.

Social Dialectology: Theoretical and technical study of dialect variation in relation to social differences, primarily in America.

Teaching English to Minority Groups: The special cultural, social, psychological, and methodological considerations involved in the English instruction of minority groups in American schools and colleges.

The Teaching of Standard English as a Second Dialect: Survey and evaluation of methods and bibliography of materials appropriate to subject. The nature of language learning, contrastive analysis, and dialect distribution and comparison.

Language and Society: Study of the patterned covariation of language and society; social dialects and social styles in language; problems of multilingual societies.

Sociolinguistics Seminar: Selected topics in social dialect, social style, language contact, multilingual societies.

In addition to the Georgetown and UCLA programs, the following schools confer a degree in the field of sociolinguistics or urban dialects:

State University of New York, College at Cortland (M.A. in English sociolinguistics);

Indiana University, Bloomington (M.A.T. in Urban and Overseas English);

University of South Carolina, Columbia (M.A. in Teaching English to Special Groups);

University of South Florida, Tampa (M.A. in Linguistics with concentration on Sociolinguistics);

University of Texas, Austin (M.A. in Applied Linguistics with concentration in Sociolinguistics);

Stanford University, Stanford, California (Ph.D. in Sociolinguistics);

Yeshiva University, New York (Ph.D. in Language and Behavior with concentration in Sociolinguistics).

All of these programs offer a combination of theoretical and applied sociolinguistics courses, but the emphasis is clearly practical at

Cortland, Indiana, Texas and South Carolina as it was at UCLA, and clearly theoretical at Stanford and Yeshiva. The program at South Florida is new and descriptions were not available for most of the courses.

Category 2: Two or more Courses

Seven universities with no degree program in the area of urban dialects offer two or more courses devoted wholly or largely to the language of the disadvantaged. These schools are listed here, with the appropriate department or program and the number of courses offered dealing in large part with sociolinguistics and urban dialects.

University of Chicago; English/Education, 5
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago; Center for American English, 3
East Texas State University, Commerce; English, 3
State University of New York, Stony Brook; Linguistics, 3
West Chester State College, West Chester, Pa.; English, 2
Texas A&M University, College Station; English, 2
Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge; Education, 2

A sampling of the course descriptions follows:

"Language of Minority Groups. The purpose of this course is to present an intensive study of the phonology, vocabulary and cultural differences that affect language. Emphasis will be placed on the language of Afro-Americans and Mexican-Americans, with consideration of the application of linguistic techniques to the study of other minority groups." (East Texas State)

"Social Dialects. A survey of methods of dialect analysis and their implications for the classroom." (Illinois Institute of Technology)

"Implications of Sociolinguistics for Instruction. An examination of possible consequences which variations of prestige forms of English may have for teaching language skills in school progress." (University of Chicago)

"Field Methods in Sociolinguistics. A sociolinguistic study of a nearby community is done by members of the class." (Stony Brook)

Category 3: One Course

A number of colleges/universities with no extensive course work in sociolinguistics treat the problems of urban dialects in English, linguistics, education, sociology, anthropology, and speech courses.

A. Sociolinguistics Courses. Twenty-three schools offer a course devoted entirely to sociolinguistics, either a general introduction to sociolinguistics, a survey of English sociolinguistics, a TESOLD methodology course, or a study of a particular urban dialect. Some sample course descriptions illustrate the types of courses being offered:

> "Sociolinguistics. Measuring and establishing correlates between linguistic behavior and social level; special attention given to the study of social dialects with an urban setting including social factors affecting language acquisition, and linguistic behavior of groups of different cultural backgrounds." (Northeastern Illinois State College, Chicago; Linguistics Department).
>
> "Problems in Urban Language. A study of social dialect fieldwork, analysis and application to teaching." (Michigan State University, East Lansing; English Department).
>
> "Urban Dialectology. Analysis and description of the inner city dialect of English spoken in Buffalo, comparing the speech patterns with those of standard English. Emphasis on morphemics and syntax. Structures presented as independent but overlapping systems. Of particular interest to those working with Buffalo schools' bidialectal situation." (State University of New York at Buffalo, Department of Linguistics).
>
> "Methods of Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect. Techniques and materials for helping students to master a standard dialect of English when some other dialect is spoken in the home. Ways of teaching standard English as an aid to overcoming social, cultural, and economic handicaps..." (Teachers College, Columbia University, New York; Department of Languages, Literature, Speech, and Theatre).
>
> "Applied Social Dialectology. Emphasis on language learning problems of the disadvantaged Afro-American. A survey of the technical aspects of relevant structural linguistic theory. An

introduction to the techniques of applied linguistics. Instruction in the implementation of these techniques in the area of language arts pedagogy." (State University College, Buffalo, New York; English Department).

"Introduction to American Negro Dialect. An introduction to the social history and structural development of American Negro dialects; the study of two representative kinds of present-day Negro dialects, Gullah and General East Coast Negro dialect; a survey of special Negro discourse styles (e.g., slang and 'fancy talk'), and the relation of dialect structures to standard English structures in the Negro speech community, pedagogical implications of Negro dialects." (Teachers College, Columbia).

The following additional universities are offering at least one course similar to those illustrated above:

Florida State University, Tallahassee (Department of English, Department of Communication);

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis (English Department);

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill (Speech Division);

Virginia State College, Petersburg (Department of English);

Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi (English Department);

Western Washington State College, Bellingham (Speech Department);

University of Texas, El Paso (Linguistics Program);

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque (Program in Linguistics and Language Pedagogy);

Queens College of the City University of New York (Linguistics Department);

Portland State University, Portland (Department of English);

Central Connecticut State College, New Britain (English Department);

University of California, Riverside (English Department);

California State College, Fullerton (Department of Linguistics, Department of English);

University of Illinois, Chicago Circle (Education Department);

University of Illinois, Urbana (Department of Linguistics).

B. Other Courses Touching on Sociolinguistics. Forty-two schools indicated that at least a part of one or more courses was devoted to the study of urban language. Of these, fourteen were "English language" courses, i.e. those dealing with English Grammar, American English, TEFL, etc. A sampling of types follows:

> "History of British and American English. Includes a large unit on American Regional and Social Dialects - about one month of class time". (Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, English Department.)
>
> "Applied English Linguistics. Readings in English structure, contrastive analysis, dialectology, and 'language and culture' with about one-third of the semester's time devoted to dialects." (St. Michael's College, Winooski, Vermont, Division of Applied Linguistics.)
>
> "Modern English Grammar. Usage dialects (including Black English), traditional, structural and transformational approaches to grammar, methods of gathering data, and the interpretation of field investigations." (Colorado State University, Fort Collins, English Department.)
>
> "The English Language. An introduction to language study for undergraduates. Includes a brief - approximately two weeks - study of dialect which includes non-standard speech/Black English." (Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana, English Department.)
>
> "English Grammar for ESL. English grammar from the point of view of a non-native speaker of English; predictable problems of non-native speakers. Much emphasis on local Spanish-influenced English; some mention of predictable usages of Black English speakers (lack of final -(e)d, -(e)s, is, etc.)." (University of Arizona, Tucson, English Department.)

Other schools reporting similar courses are:

University of Wisconsin, Madison
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
State University College, New Paltz, New York
Marillac College, St. Louis
University of Delaware, Newark

Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas

Central College, Pella, Iowa

California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo .

Thirteen schools offered "linguistics" courses, i.e. general linguistics, dialectology, child language, with a unit on urban language. Typical of such courses are the following:

"General Linguistics. An overview of the study of language including socio- and psycho-linguistics, study of minority dialects and attitudes toward them." (University of San Francisco, English Department.)

"Language Development. A survey of current research on language development in children, emphasizing theoretical issues and research methods. This course includes sections on non-standard dialect development, and educational programs focusing on language." (University of Washington, Seattle, Linguistics Department.)

"Introductory Linguistics. Sociolinguistics forms part of this course, which is designed primarily to acquaint pre-service and in-service teachers with basic linguistic concepts." (Notre Dame College, St. Louis, English Department.)

"Dialectology. An introduction to the linguistic principles and methods involved in the study of geographical, social, and stylistic variation within language." (Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Linguistic Department.)

"Dialectology. Theory, methods and problems in dialectology and sociolinguistics. Considerable time is spent on oral language of disadvantaged children." (Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana, English Department.)

Other schools offering similar courses are:

Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas

University of Michigan, Flint College, Flint

Emory University, Atlanta

State University College, Brockport, New York

Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois

Mercer University, Macon, Georgia

Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Six schools reported courses in "Language and Culture" or "Language and Society" which dealt with the urban language question. Typical are:

> "Communication and Society. The course introduces the student to the sociological study of language aspects of human communication behavior stressing relationships between symbolic communication and the establishment of social structure. Attention is given to such topics as analysis of the languages of poverty, the ghetto, social class, etc." (Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, Department of Sociology and Anthropology.)
>
> "Language and Culture. Anthropological study of language which includes discussion of work of Labov, Bernstein, Cazden, etc." (University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Anthropology Department.)
>
> "Speech and Society. Social variation in language: bilingualism and dialect variation using Chicano and Black varieties as examples. Variation between social groups, style variation within speakers, and social correlates of each." (University of California, Berkeley, Rhetoric Department.)

Other schools in this category are:

> Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland
>
> University of Wisconsin, Madison
>
> Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina

Six schools reported "Education" courses which included a unit on urban dialect. Though the number is small the diversity in the course content is great. The two examples following illustrate the range:

> "Language and School Programs. Applied linguistics in the elementary school. Language difference is a major concern." (Wayne State University, Detroit, College of Education.)
>
> "Methods of Teaching Slow-Learning Children. This involves a unit of work dealing with sound approaches to language and expression. An effort is made to direct attention to the mother tongue as proper use to release sound emotional effect, then to inspire standard forms as they relate to job or socio-cultural wishes." (Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach, Florida, Division of Education.)

The other schools in this category fall closer on the continuum to Bethune-Cookman than Wayne State. They are:

Creighton University, Omaha

Paine College, Augusta, Georgia

Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington

University of Maryland, College Park

In the field of "Speech," three schools reported courses dealing with inner-city language.

"Introduction to Language Disorders. Effects of cognitive lag and disadvantaged environment upon language development and patterns; morphology and syntax; differentiation of dialects from articulatory disorders." (University of Mississippi, University, Department of Communicative Disorders.)

"Speech Improvement for the Classroom. Special course content is provided on speech and language differences brought to urban classrooms by children of differing socio-economic and racial backgrounds. The educational, social, vocational and psychological implications of these differences are discussed together with current philosophies of teaching or habilitation." (Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania, Department of Communication Disorders.)

"Speech Pathology. In this course the methods of modern psycholinguistic research are applied to the classification and management of speech and language disorders. Approximately one-fifth of the course deals with the application of sociolinguistic considerations by the speech and language therapist." (George Washington University, Washington, D.C., Department of Speech and Drama.)

The majority of schools responding affirmatively to the survey fall into the third category, indicating that the offerings in sociolinguistics/urban dialect are indeed small in number and not very substantial in scope. In summation, the current picture for training teachers and researchers to deal with sociolinguistic/urban language problems is not a bright one: only nine schools in the country offer degree programs in sociolinguistics and of these only three offer the Ph.D.; very few other schools (seven) offer even two courses in the field; of the approximately 2,500 colleges and universities in the U.S. there are no more than 75 which deal with urban

language as a small unit of an English language/dialectology/language and culture course; the number of pertinent courses available to future elementary school teachers is pitifully small, and of those offered, none are adequate to the needs. While the survey techniques were admittedly limited (broad population, no follow-up) and therefore the statistics may be rough, observations of those from different disciplines currently working in the field of urban language corroborate the overall picture.

Thirteen schools did, however, indicate future offerings (1970-71 or 1971-72 academic year) ranging from a B.A. program in sociolinguistics (University of California at Santa Cruz) to an "open seminar" in urban studies (Millersville State College, Millersville, Pennsylvania). Other schools indicating future offerings are:

Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, South Dakota
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania
Butler University, Indianapolis
San Diego State College, San Diego
University of Colorado, Boulder
Oregon State University, Corvallis
Western College, Oxford, Ohio
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh
Indiana University at Fort Wayne
Temple University, Philadelphia

Except for Santa Cruz and Pittsburgh, the future offerings will consist of only one course or part of a course.

Category 4: Research/Special Projects

Of the five research reports, three were from university departments, and two were from research centers, one university-based and one private.

The English Department of Western Kentucky University reported on research done during a summer EPDA Institute, where each participant, under the direction of a linguist, "observed the language of one child (black or white) from disadvantaged background."

Temple University's Department of Speech reported an experiment in the "Development of Functional Dialectalism and Language Expansion"; using four inner city elementary schools.

In the research cited above, both the faculty and students were involved, and the project would fall somewhere between "research" and "student field work" or "student teaching/practicum", questions 6 and 7 of the questionnaire. The Sociology Department at the University of Washington reported on research on "The Semantic Distinctiveness of the American Language as Employed by Blacks", a faculty project.

The two research centers reporting were the Research and Development Center for Cognitive Learning of the University of Wisconsin, Madison, and the Language Research Foundation, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Both reported that scattered research was taking place on the broad topics of: the study of various English dialects; the assessment of the language development of pre-school children; the reflection of culture in the use of language; the development of a theory of comparative dialectology and the linguistic aspects of reading problems of disadvantaged children.

Since the survey was concerned mainly with training, information on research was gathered only peripherally, and the above listing is neither complete nor systematic. It represents only information that happened to come to our attention via the survey questionnaire. An important research resource that should be added are the various urban language studies being conducted here at the Center for Applied Linguistics.

FIELD WORK/PRACTICE TEACHING

As to question 6, availability of field work or practice teaching, most of the education courses included some practice teaching, but little of the practice related to language. Field work appeared as a separate course where degree programs in sociolinguistics were indicated (Category 1B) or as a substantial part of a course or courses dealing with sociolinguistics (Categories 2 and 3A). On the whole though, real data collection and analysis was scanty.

TEXT MATERIAL

Those answering question 5 of the questionnaire showed a marked consistency in the choice of text material. The Urban Language Series

of the Center for Applied Linguistics (1: Social Stratification of English in New York City, by William Labov; 2: Conversations in a Negro American Dialect, by Bengt Loman; 3: Field Techniques in an Urban Language Study, by Roger W. Shuy, Walter A. Wolfram and William K. Riley; 4: Teaching Black Children to Read. by Joan C. Baratz and Roger W. Shuy; 5: A Sociolinguistic Description of Detroit Negro Speech, by Walt Wolfram) was mentioned most often, along with Linguistic-Cultural Differences and American Education, a special anthology issue of The Florida FL Reporter, edited by Alfred C. Aarons, Barbara Gordon and William A. Stewart. Also mentioned often were selected documents from the ERIC system, among them William Labov's "The Study of Non-Standard English". Reporting of the above materials cut across discipline lines, and appeared in questionnaires of all five of the departments covered.

Listed below are the other texts most often, though not exclusively, cited by the various departments:

English: American English, by Albert H. Marckwardt; Words and Ways of American English, by Thomas Pyles; Readings in Applied English Linguistics, by Harold B. Allen; The Structure of American English, by W. Nelson Francis; Dialects of American English, by Carroll E. Reed; Discovering American Dialects, by Roger W. Shuy.

Sociology: Explorations in Sociolinguistics, by Stanley Lieberson; Language in Culture and Society, by Dell Hymes; The Ethnography of Communication, by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes; plus articles by Dan Slobin and Basil Bernstein.

Linguistics: Readings in Sociolinguistics, by Joshua Fishman; Sociolinguistics, by William Bright; Languages in Contact, by Uriel Weinreich; plus articles by William Labov, Charles Ferguson, Einar Haugen, Raven McDavid, Roger Shuy and William A. Stewart.

Education: Non-Standard Dialects, by the New York City Board of Education; The Disadvantaged: Challenge to Education, by Mario Fantini and Gerald Weinstein; Teaching Disadvantaged Children in the Preschool, by Carl Bereiter and Siegfried Englemann, as well as articles by Bereiter and/or Englemann.

Speech: Only a few speech departments listed any text material, and none of the titles were in addition to those already mentioned.

SITE VISITS

In an effort to probe more intensively into the nature of the various curricula represented in this survey, it was decided that on-site visits would be made to different types of programs. Chosen were: a university which had only one course relevant to social dialect (Michigan State University); three universities with M.A. programs (Indiana University, State College of New York at Courtland and U.C.L.A.) and one university with a Ph.D. program in sociolinguistics (Georgetown).

Michigan State University, with a single course devoted to the study of social dialects, has had this course in its catalogue for five years (although last winter it was taught for the first time). The English Department, in which the course was offered, formerly had a professor who did active research in this area but after he left, the course went largely unnoticed. Recently, however, a new depar ment chairman has brought a new concern for educational and social matters to that department. He is greatly concerned about how his department trains future English teachers and he considers the area of social dialects crucial. Consequently, he called in an outsider to teach the course. The visiting professor was flown in once a week during the winter quarter to teach some thirty undergraduate and ten graduate students. Their majors were varied. Some were from speech, some from communications, one was from linguistics, about 25% were from English and an equal number were education majors. The emphasis of the course was practical rather than theoretical, although research projects of various types were discussed. Since no previous linguistics training was required, some of the class time had to be devoted to explaining terms such as copula, inter-dental fricative, deep structure, etc. Each student engaged in a fieldwork project which involved him in tape recording the speech of a local child, then analyzing certain features found in that recording. The graduate students and upper-level undergraduates seemed to find the course stimulating but all agreed that some general linguistics background would have been helpful.

Of the M.A. programs which focus on social dialects, the UCLA program is the oldest. It has grown out of the English Department which has offered an M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language (or Dialect), TESOL(D),for several years. The paranthetical part of the program,

however, is very recent, and UCLA has now hired a faculty member who has done research and writing in the specific areas related to social dialect. Until this time, such courses were handled by a knowledgeable and competent faculty member with a more literary background and interest. The site visit was done when the latter was the major social dialect representative in that department. Even with his admittedly weak background, the program was definitely covering the right topics, publications and activities. It was supplemented heavily by outside consultants and lecturers and at least part of the classroom instruction was done by a knowledgeable, black graduate student.

The UCLA program, at the time of the site visit, was praised highly by the chairmen of both the English and Linguistics Departments. The English Department chairman, in particular, seemed to regard it as one of the more significant things being done at UCLA. His vice-chairman, who actually heads the program, is a well-known scholar in TESOL who, like many people in that field, is very much interested in finding with precision the relationships between TESOL methodology and teaching standard English. Although it was obvious to the site visitor that minority-group speech is a topic of high interest both to the faculty and to many students at UCLA, it was difficult to assess the Linguistics Department's attitude with accuracy. Perhaps as an artifact of the current gulf which seems to separate theoretical from applied linguistics, there was a noticeable shying-away from getting too involved on the part of some linguistics majors and faculty. Perhaps this gulf is a result of some local tension which could not be unearthed in the short time which the visit permitted. Perhaps it is related to the growing gulf between theoretical and applied linguistics. Or, possibly, it is related to the fact that many of the graduate students in the TESOL(D) program were foreign students who planned to use their new knowledge in their home countries. Whatever the reason, it was clear that a certain amount of effort will be required to bring the two departments together in reasonable harmony.

The M.A. program in Applied Sociolinguistics at the State College of New York at Courtland, now finishing its first year, was site visited very early in its planning stages. Like the UCLA program, it has a TESOL base, inasmuch as the training provided is to enable the student to

operate effectively both with foreign students and with non-standard speaking natives. The problem of staffing the faculty position which deals directly with the literature, research activities and theory of non-standard speech was solved by Courtland's hiring a former field-worker for the Detroit Dialect Study. This staff member also is knowledgeable about various South American languages, having spent several years there as a missionary.

The new program at Courtland has the complete support of the President of the College, with whom the Director of the program has good rapport. The Director built the proposal carefully, working with consultants in the field and establishing an interested advisory board which includes the chairman of a linguistics department in another SUNY setting.

The M.A. program in Urban and Overseas English at Indiana University has direct antecedents in the TESOL program at that school. Like UCLA and Courtland, it attempts to knit together an extant program for training teachers to be specialists in English for foreigners with a new concern for the urban black. Its first Director was a black faculty member but after only several months he was promoted to another responsible position on the faculty and was replaced by a specialist in English education and TESOL. This program, like many others on American campuses today, reflects the university's response to pressures from their black students. Although such universities should be praised for such responses, one can ask several questions about the appropriateness of lumping an interest in social dialects with a language learning program for non-native speakers. Indiana's first course which dealt directly with that aspect of the program to which "Urban" refers was offered as an inter-session course in June, 1970. It was staffed by one local TESOL specialist, who provided continuity and framing but was conducted primarily by four outside lecturers who have been doing research in the field. Indiana has no faculty member whose specialty matches this area at the moment and it is not clear exactly how the course will be handled in the future.

The doctoral program in sociolinguistics which was site visited was at Georgetown University. Georgetown, under special funding from the Ford Foundation, has been offering two courses in sociolinguistics

for the past four years in addition to two courses, funded by USOE, in a special experienced-teacher-MAT program. Beginning in September 1970, Georgetown expands its doctoral program in linguistics to include, along with majors in either theoretical or applied linguistics, a third major, sociolinguistics. The basic curriculum for this program was described earlier although it might be added here that those who select this major are encouraged to minor in theoretical and applied linguistics.

The faculty members for this new program were recruited from other universities and research programs as well as from the extant Georgetown staff despite the fact that the grant from The National Science Foundation which gave birth to the program was awarded in May, rather late for starting a new program. The new director of this program is a sociolinguist who has been writing and doing research in this field. The new full-time staff member has been working closely with the director in sociolinguistic research for the past three years. A third new faculty member is an anthropological linguist who has specialized in African-Pidgin languages and the ethnography of communication. The NSF grant also calls for a fourth faculty member, but the shortness of the time did not permit the university to fill this slot. It is being filled, partially at least, by part-time staff.

The Sociolinguistics Program at Georgetown recognizes the student's need first to have a solid foundation in theoretical linguistics upon which to build his sociolinguistic skills. Other than the introductory courses, the major courses in the program are primarily of a seminar or individual-research-type. The director places a high value on the operational training of researchers, feeling that involvement in an actual research project with an experienced faculty researcher has advantages over a more abstract, lecture-type program. To insure an active research component, the NSF award specifies that the four full-time faculty members teach only half-time, the other half being devoted to research responsibilities.

The NSF award at Georgetown also provided for eight full-time graduate fellowships of $6000 per year for the three-year duration of the grant. The lateness of the award made it extremely difficult for the university to make these awards within the usual time limitations. But the announcement was made, and there were sufficient applicants for eight excellent prospective sociolinguists.

Observations and Conclusions

The present state of training facilities and opportunities for teachers or researchers who will deal with urban language problems is very much like the resources available for linguistics and English as a foreign language in 1962-63. The inadequacies and needs made evident by the present survey are very much akin to those which emerged from a similar survey done by the Center in 1962-63, which resulted in the booklet University Resources in the United States for Linguistics and the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language. The following generalization can be made from the findings of the present survey, and corroboration can be found from the findings of the 1962 survey.

1. There are few college/university offerings which deal substantially with the urban language/social dialects/Black English phenomenon. Of the 2,640 questionnaires mailed, only 375 were returned, over two-thirds of which were either blank, or offered no course which could be construed in whole or in part to deal with this topic. The academic institutions noted in this report as offering a course or course unit in urban language may represent only a partial listing (there are always some schools with relevant information which fail to complete the questionnaire), but observations of those working in the urban language field bear out the small positive response. Similarly, in the 1962 survey, over 1,800 questionnaires were circularized, and only 79 schools could be listed as having relevant courses. Similarly too, the questionnaire results confirmed the intuition of those teaching linguistics, and though a few more schools could have been added to the list, the overall picture would not have changed.

2. There is great confusion as to what Black English/Urban Language/Urban Dialects/Sociolinguistics actually is. A glance at the completed, but rejected, questionnaires shows that schools have heard the above terms, but some have rather naive interpretations of them. Thus we have a course title such as "Teaching Racially Undifferentiated English to Racially Different Children" and a course description for "Teaching in the Inner City School" which includes "...to acquaint teachers with a profile of the student and his problems (including

misuse of English)...". The 1962 Survey included course titles such as "Teaching Grammar Using Linguistics" and questions such as "What kind of linguistics would you teach to enable students to write better compositions?". As linguistics was a new word and semi-known to many in 1962, urban language or Black English or non-standard English is confusing and being confused today. There seems to be a need for a massive clarification campaign addressed largely to present educators and schools of education.

3. <u>There is little interdisciplinary cooperation on individual campuses</u>. The University of Texas, whose Education Department offers a degree program in applied linguistics with concentration in sociolinguistics also offers 20 other pertinent courses through its Folklore Department, Sociology Department, Speech Department, Anthropology Department, Linguistics Department, English Department and Department of African and Asian Languages. Where more than one questionnaire was received from a school, there was often no indication of courses in the other department, and the instance of a degree program in urban education which did not even recommend pertinent courses in the English Department has already been noted. The earlier linguistics survey found the same scattered situation in 1962-63, but when the survey was again conducted in 1964-65, there had formed in the interim many interdisciplinary committees on linguistics to oversee linguistic/language teaching.

4. <u>There is still no clear direction for the development of a program to train either researchers or teachers in the field of sociolinguistics/urban language/social dialects/Black English</u>. Although it is quite clear that the impetus for developing such programs has come primarily from linguistics, most linguistics departments have not yet moved as far along in curriculum development as Stanford or Georgetown. There is, however, a clear trend which seems to indicate that most linguistics departments would be happy to have a bona fide sociolinguist in residence. If there is hesitancy, it comes primarily from the lack of available candidates for the position. To be sure, departments other than linguistics are training researchers. Notable are the anthropology departments at the universities of Pennsylvania, Michigan, California and Texas and

the education or early childhood departments at Harvard, Yeshiva, Stanford and Chicago. And, of course, the tradition of specialization under the dominant tuteledge of one or two scholars continues in the English Departments of such schools as the Universities of Chicago, Northwestern and Wisconsin and in the Speech or Communications Departments of such schools as Texas and California.

If there is a trend for the development of such programs it seems to be of two types:

a. The training of researchers, with a theoretical emphasis, appears to be strongest in doctoral programs which have developed in linguistics departments and which can be characterized as having sympathy with both theoretical and applied linguistics. Linguistics departments which can be characterized as having little or no sympathy with applied linguistics have tended to relegate sociolinguistics (as well as other hyphenated linguistics courses) to other departments or to minor roles within the linguistics department. Such departments do not generally distinguish between the application of linguistic knowledge to pedagogy (applied linguistics) and the intersection of linguistic knowledge with bodies of knowledge from other fields such as sociology, anthropology or psychology (relational linguistics).

b. The training of teachers, with a practical emphasis, appears to be strongest in MA or MAT programs in English and education departments. The most common pattern to date seems to be that which is based on an extant TESOL program. The social dialect component has developed as a kind of tag-on to an extant program in an honest attempt to update the relevance of the program to current needs. This has been done in spite of the fact that increasingly the research has shown that second language and second dialect teaching and learning are of quite different natures. To some it will appear that there is something unsettling about the idea that the problems of minority group ative English speakers can be handled with a tag-on to an ongoing TESOL program. Some will argue that a practical MA or MAT program for teachers of such children deserves a focus all its own.

While the present picture of urban language training opportunities is rather frustrating, some hope might be garnered from the present picture of linguistic training opportunities. The 1969-70 edition of University Resources in the United States and Canada for the Study of Linguistics (included as an appendix to the interim report on this contract) shows 146 institutions offering substantial programs in linguistics. While the course of urban language/Black English/sociolinguistic programs will probably not run exactly parallel to that of linguistics, a survey of resources in 1972, and continued site visits, should produce more concise and substantial information. This is, however, based on the assumption that the information about the present state of affairs will spark some reorganization of course work and reordering of goals and priorities.

PART IV

SOCIAL DIALECTS AND THE FEDERAL CONCERN

The three studies reported in this volume point to six major areas of priority for future federal involvement in the area of social dialects. These areas of priority can be summarized under the headings: Research Development, Reading, Training Programs, Attitudes toward Language, the Roles of Language, Classroom Procedures, and Evaluation.

A. Research Development

All of the disciplines represented in this study appeared to be guilty of doing their research in relative isolation from their subjects. If this isolation is not physical it is caused by other things such as a failure to understand what a child really means by his personal use of the English language.

The educators observed that in their field there is vagueness about the locus of the children's problems in their use of language. The vagueness is so strong that knowledge of vocabulary is confused with knowledge of verb forms or, even more devastating, a child's failure to produce Standard English is equated with his lack of intelligence. It was noted, further, that educational researchers tend to err in equating performance on a test as evidence of ability, in urging conformity to School English regardless of whether or not communication is impaired, in assuming causation from correlation and in arguing that because a program is good, we can speed up the education process by offering it even earlier.

The psychologists questioned whether they are equipped to deal with the study of dialects since their experimental framework of pre- and post-testing, control groups, etc. is geared to deficiency measurement, not culturally patterned differences. It was further observed that the psychologist's preference for comparative and correlational research methodologies tends to play down the need for a preceding stage: that of a careful, ethnological and linguistic description.

The linguist's work on the other hand, has been characterized by careful description, but only seldom with children and usually in ways that are not satisfying to the demands of the social sciences. That is, linguists have not tended to describe speech in terms of the many context sensitivities which clearly exist. They have not paid careful attention to effect of sex, age, race, status, styles and monitoring. Their sampling

has been naive and they have not begun to understand how statistical analysis might be helpful.

The speech and communication representatives characterized the research of their field as myopically pathological. The pathology model in speech therapy has clearly blinded the field (until recently, at least) to the fact that legitimate, non-pathological language differences actually exist.

It was generally agreed that the concepts currently being developed by sociolinguists had the most relevance to the broad study of social dialects today. The sociolinguists can be characterized as being closer to the social sciences than linguists frequently care to get, yet equipped to deal with language in a linguistically respectable fashion. Still the research concepts of sociolinguistics have only just begun to develop. The concepts of registers, styles, marking, monitoring, the linguistic continuum, the linguistic variable and others are still being developed and changed but the use of these concepts is fundamental in any research on the social aspects of language. Very little sociolinguistic research has been done with small children and any number of questions remain unanswered.

1. Program Development

From this, a number of directions for future development may be noted. One priority for the federal government is to assist research centers and universities in developing programs in training researchers which approach social dialects with a linguistically sound description, with a realistic assessment of the various social contexts in which such language is used and with an adequate sorting out of the cognitive and pathological from the social parameters of speech. One approach to meeting this priority would be to provide the mechanism for bringing researchers together under some sort of new interdisciplinary umbrella. It is worth noting that the major centers of social dialect research in this country at the present time have made a certain amount of progress at developing such mechanisms. It should be clear, however, that mechanisms of this sort will differ, depending on the nature of the university, the available talent, and other variables.

a. The Laboratory Model

At the University of California, the mechanism appears to be development of the Language-Behavior Research Laboratory, funded primarily by the university's Institute of International Studies. Scholars from psychology, speech, linguistics and anthropology are enabled by this mechanism to join forces and be mutually stimulating.

b. The University Department Model

At Georgetown University, however, the emerging mechanism is quite different. There the School of Languages and Linguistics, which had previously housed programs in both theoretical and applied linguistics, has recently been given National Science Foundation support for a third doctoral program, this one in Sociolinguistics. On the staff already are linguists, psycholinguists, sociolinguists, anthropologists and educators, and efforts are currently underway to involve the Department of Sociology. This mechanism is unique, however, in that the extant program structure was amenable to this sort of expansion and a peculiarity of the institution, that it has no education or anthropology departments, made it possible to incorporate scholars from these areas directly into the linguistics department framework.

The University of Texas has as vast a program in research on social dialect as will be found in any other part of the country but a unifying mechanism has not yet been established. Consequently, it was not possible even to obtain a complete listing of courses at that university from any single department or person. The interests are strong, the scholars are active and, if a student were to manage his schedule properly, he could obtain valuable training from well-known scholars in linguistics, anthropology, folk-lore, English, speech, psychology and communications. But there appears to be no way, at present, that this management can take place.

c. The Intra-Departmental Model

In addition to training researchers together by using the laboratory model and the departmental model, the federal government might stimulate the development of research involving social dialect by encouraging interdisciplinary approaches within given university departments. For example, it should be useful for a speech department to hire a trained sociolinguist or for a linguistics department to add a sociologist who could address himself to sampling and statistics questions relevant to language. One of the most pressing needs, as has been pointed out, is for education departments to take on specialists with expertise in language, especially social dialects.

2. Project Development

In addition to the more obvious focus on the development of research programs at universities and other research centers, a priority of the federal government is to support new projects in social dialect such as the following. Although considerable progress has been made in the past two years, it is clear that each new success brings realization of a number of things that need to be done next. It has been suggested that although we are beginning to know some things about language variation between large groups of various sorts, we still need to know a great deal about variation within groups. Although we have learned to think in terms of a continuum of speech ranges, we have relatively little objective knowledge about the continuum. We need to know how we can assess a person's range of styles. We need to know considerably more about the role of hypercorrection in language learning and analysis. Linguists need to know more about the notion of inherent variability in language and how it relates to dialect mixture. We know practically nothing about the role of social factors in historical language change or about the apparent indications that certain aspects of a language are predisposed for modification, whether from second languages or dialect interference, pidginization or normal acquisition. We need to know how much and what kind of speech is enough to cause stereotyping. For linguistics, the study of social factors leads to a question of the extent to which linguistic descriptions can incorporate context sensitive rules whose environment is stated in terms of extra-linguistic factors.

Despite our recent emphasis on the speech of black people, we still need many more descriptive studies, even of the speech of blacks, especially in the rural and urban south. We need to know more about the language assimilation and swamping that take place during migration. And we need to know more about other non-standards besides the ones used by some black people. Of particular interest would be the non-standard English systems used by Appalachians and Southern whites. Obviously we need many studies which show age grading, especially at post-language-acquisitional stages. We need to know at what age the adult norms of sensitivity to social consequences of language take place and the sequences which this sensitivity is apt to follow. Since so little knowledge exists about stylistic

variation in speech, we need to study this intensively in many settings, even with upper class children. We need research in the optional size and nature of language sampling, in the effective use of statistical contributions to linguistic analysis and in the influence of the field-worker on the speech of informants.

In the discussion following the presentation of individual papers and responses at the conference, several other research project priorities were brought up. It was generally agreed that we need to develop a workable taxonomy of language functions that we can agree on as a premise so that ensuing discussions about the comparative functions of different languages or dialects can be made meaningful. It was suggested that it is possible that by educating a group of people to avoid certain aspects of their speech, we actually may be depriving them of an important life function. Thus, for example, if blacks are encouraged to stop rapping and signifying, an important solidarity function may be removed. The study of language functions, then, was considered a priority of great importance at this time.

Another issue which was discussed frequently at the conference involved the question of who should be doing research on social dialects. There was no total agreement among the participants at that conference just as there seems to be ambivalence in the scholarly world as a whole. One black participant warned that the spirit of identity now underway in the black community and the spirit of rebellion against an identity defined by outsiders is a strong warning to white researchers that their definitions of black language will not necessarily be welcomed. Another participant observed: "No outside group can make policy concerning a very strong cultural trait of a people. That is, whites cannot make decisions as to whether or not Navahos should get rid of their language. Likewise, I do not think we can make policy about whether or not blacks should get rid of their language." When asked exactly what it is that white researchers can provide in this area, one black participant responded that whites can clarify and present the alternatives which blacks then can either accept or reject.

This question of exactly how much the race of the researcher affects his usefulness to either the community being researched or the technical

problem under study is crucial for the development of research in this area. On the one hand the psychologists and educators at the conference admitted that although they should be given credit for tackling problems which had been ignored by linguists and anthropologists, their fields have been slow to take into consideration the impact that the race of the researcher might have on his results. One linguist present, on the other hand, pointed out that the whole anthropological and linguistic tradition of research has been based on foreigners being able to see that which insiders consider familiar as unfamiliar. It was pointed out that some of the best analyses of English, in the early days at least, were done by non-English speakers. The discussion concluded with a general clarification of the topic as related to three different aspects of research rather than to research by itself. These three topics are:

1. Collecting the data
2. Analyzing the data
3. Implementing programs based on the data

There was some agreement, but by no means unanimous, that the white researcher's role in the study of black speech was primarily in the first two categories, although even there his work might be aided considerably by black researchers. In matters of implementation, however, the role of the white researcher was generally regarded as consultative rather than dominant. It would seem that despite this general agreement, one priority of the federal government should be to determine on a broader scale and in more detail what effect the race of the researcher has on the successful completion of research involving social dialect, whether in collection, analysis or implementation.

B. Reading

A second area of priority which this report highlights involves reading. Not only is reading prominent in the minds of public school officials, politicians and government representatives, it is also clearly in the thinking of researchers who are concerned about social dialects. Now that a foothold has been made toward the description of the speech of ghetto children, several implications of these analyses can be tested. It has been suggested, for example, that learning to read depends on the status of speech development, yet we know very little about the specific

aspects of speech development which play this crucial role. There is no evidence that learning to understand written language (as contrasted with reading aloud) is affected by the child's dialect of English. In fact we might measure how much control of Standard English it is necessary for a child to have developed before he can comprehend beginning reading materials. In short, one priority is for the exploration of the structural relations between the child's oral comprehension skills, his speech, and reading and writing. If it is true that the underlying forms of the non-standard and standard varieties are the same, what does this imply about the acquisition of reading?

C. Training Programs

We have already spoken of the need to develop new, more interdisciplinary training programs for professional researchers. It is obvious that scholars concerned about cognitive development be able to see this in relationship to the social influences on language acquisition. Reading researchers should become well versed in the social dialects of the groups they are measuring in order to conduct their measurements accurately. Researchers who assess pathologies of various sorts must learn to distinguish between socially induced difference and pathological deficit. Linguists who generalize about the grammar or phonology of a group of people will have to account for the realities of social dialect as they make their descriptions. Sociologists who discuss social stratification may find useful, new indicators in the realm of language.

Equally crucial, however, is the priority of establishing or revising teacher training programs for instructors in speech, the language arts, reading and written composition. The conference participants who represented speech indicated that there is a growing awareness in their field of a need for training in social dialects. Such an awareness, however healthy, could easily cause a crisis in the training of speech clinicians. If the certification requirements of speech clinicians were suddenly modified to include an undergraduate course in sociolinguistics, we could have hundreds of poorly conceived and ill-taught courses springing up across the land. It would be better if this impending situation were met with reasonably advanced planning of the sort that the federal government might sponsor. A major priority, then, is for us to investigate ways of

preparing experienced and pre-service speech clinicians in matters relating to social dialect.

A similar situation exists in the preparation of teachers of reading, language arts and written composition. The field of reading has only recently showed signs of realizing that reading is largely a language-processing operation. The training of reading teachers can and must go through a rather drastic overhaul to put language oriented courses at the center of the curriculum rather than on the periphery. If reading teachers can be introduced to child language in a realistic setting, it should also be possible to introduce them to the language varieties often found in ghettos. To accomplish this, both linguistics departments and teacher-preparation programs will have to modify their current positions, for it is doubtful that extant linguistics courses can be transplanted intact into a teacher-preparation curriculum. Likewise linguists who are used to addressing themselves to other kinds of issues will have to modify their instruction to the relevant pedagogical problems of beginning teachers of reading and the language arts. The priority here is for the development of model programs which bridge the gulf between linguistics and education departments in the pre- and in-service preparation of elementary school teachers. On the higher grade levels teachers should be trained, as a minimal requirement, to understand non-standard speech. In composition classes, they should be taught how to diagnose socially induced errors, to know that such errors are predictable, that such forms are not an indication of low intelligence or ability, and how to help a child gradually acquire the standard forms in writing.

D. Attitudes Toward Language

Although the literature on attitudes toward language is slowly growing, there are many things about which we do not have adequate knowledge. One major focus of contemporary education has been to adjust the non-standard speaker's language to come closer to the acceptable language norms of the educated majority. It has been argued, with great plausibility, that it might be more appropriate for educators, speech teachers and linguists to work on the attitudes of the majority rather than on the speech of the minority. There can be no question about this need. To a certain extent, efforts have been made in recent years to manipulate the attitudes of

teachers toward the systematic, regular and graceful speech of their ghetto black children. It is felt that the first step toward teaching children anything is a clear recognition that their speech is not ugly or chaotic, just different from the schoolroom variety which the teachers seem to prefer. Obviously this attitude could be spread to an even wider spectrum of the majority. The priority here is to encourage the development of different attitudes toward non-standard English, especially that variety used by inner-city black children, on the part of other children, teachers, employers and on other levels of society.

In the area of language attitudes we also need to know more about how the teacher's use of language (including the more formal styles but also the vernacular) in the classroom influences their students' attitudes. Some newer materials intended to teach Standard English to non-standard speaking children make use of both standard and non-standard in the teaching materials in order to take advantage of the long respected educational technique of learning by contrast. It would be useful to know what effect non-standard language out of the predictable context will have on the learners. This sort of attitudinal information would be equally useful in assessing the recent materials which teach beginning reading in the child's "home" language.

More language attitude studies have been done using adult speech samples as stimuli, adult judge-respondents or both. Another priority is to discover more about children's subjective reactions to language. At what age can children accurately identify specific speaker categories? Do girls perform better than boys? At what age can judgements of race first be made? At what age do children begin to adopt adult norms of language judgement?

Through a study of language attitudes we can also learn more about which features of minority groups speech contribute most to unintelligibility and/or to reactions of prejudice. It is not enough to merely catalogue the differences between standard and non-standard speech; we must also devise ways of determining which ones stigmatize more than others and, if possible, we must specify the points on a continuum of stigmatization.

Lastly, we need to know more about the attitudes of black parents, teachers and community leaders about the language goals of their children.

How important is it to them that the children acquire Standard English? Since the acquisition of Standard English seems not to be necessary for the cognitive processes or intellectual growth, the decision concerning its importance must be based on values of the sort that this sort of study should reveal.

E. The Roles of Language

Historically the study of dialects has only marginally concerned itself with the special communicative demands imposed on children of different social classes and ethnicities. We need to know more about their communicative behaviors, not only how they talk but when they talk as well. We need to know how the details of social dialect enter into the communication demands of a subculture. We need to learn more about how to teach about different types of communication situations and demands when we teach a child to master alternative dialects.

Even more specific to the needs of the pedagogy, we need to learn more about the many roles of language in the classroom. What is the place of reading and writing in the linguistic life of a child? Is literacy necessary for survival?

F. Classroom Procedures

With respect to classroom procedures, we have already noted that reading is a primary concern of our times. It has been mentioned that a high priority of attention should be given to the relationship of social dialects to the acquisition of reading skills.

Another priority concerns the question of how children can acquire Standard English when the only language they hear outside the classroom is quite different. We need evidence on how stylistic consistency can be learned amidst co-occurrence constraints. We need to investigate the usefulness of role playing and the sort of bi-polar contrasts currently advocated in certain bidialectal matters.

It has been said that foreign languages are easier to learn before adolescence than after. Does this assertion apply to learning a second dialect? We need to devote considerable attention to detailing the differences between second language and second dialect acquisition.

Lastly we need to explore teaching methods for increasing competence in code-switching and to find out the ages in which different methods are suitable for teaching.

G. Evaluation

The measurement of language abilities, like educational measurements in many other areas, is being seriously questioned today. We have a crisis in confidence on our hands with respect to exactly what it means to measure reading ability, language acquisition, reading readiness, IQ or achievement. In the highly structured programs such as those developed by Bereiter and Engelmann, Karnes and others, we have no way of knowing exactly what it is the children are learning. Part II of this report clearly indicates that the next logical step to take in the area of oral language materials is one which will measure how effective the various available materials are, how generalizable they may be to larger audiences than those for which they were developed, how they can be best taught and what the teacher needs to know in order to teach them most efficiently. The major problem is in developing diagnostic and achievement tests, since it is clear that more traditional language tests are of a quite different nature than those that attempt to measure a student's ability to switch from one appropriate dialect to another or those that try to take into account the realities of linguistic variability. One priority, then, is the development of new, realistic, effective measures of "standardness" in oral language. Until such instruments are developed it will be impossible to assess the true value of any newly developed or extant materials which proposed to teach Standard English to speakers of a non-standard variety. For speech clinicians, similar but not identical dianostic instruments need to be developed which will differentiate dialect differences from language deficiencies. Since this differentiation is needed on such a large scale across the country, attention might be given to developing some sort of self-instructional package.

If we are to truly assess a child's true language competence, we must develop tests of this competence in the child's own dialect. It has been suggested that one potentially fruitful avenue to this sort of measurement would be to first search for speech events, testing situations and linguistic patterns familiar to the children of the non-standard English speaking group. After the testing materials are developed and validated by this group, they can be translated into middle-class Standard English instruments. The usual approach, to date, has been to do just exactly the opposite. That is, we have been starting with the standard test, then translating it into a non-standard framework.

Although there has been considerable concern expressed recently on the effect of a child's dialect on his scores on other kinds of tests, we need further specific investigation in this field. Presumably, any child who meets the natural demands of his primary speech community is developing normally. The problem is that current diagnostic procedures may trap a child into trying to meet the performance demands of a community other than his primary one. This typically occurs on tests where the grammatical criteria are based solely upon Standard English or where developmental norms have been based upon the behavior of users of Standard English.

What is needed, then, are procedures that (idealistically) test for development in terms of linguistic universals or ones which are adapted to the child's primary dialect community.

In the area of reading, a grand evaluation needs to be made of the current four models of dealing with the relationship of non-standard English and the development of reading skills: (1) Teaching Standard English before a child is taught to read; (2) Accepting a child's oral renditions of Standard written English; (3) Developing beginning reading materials in the child's own dialect; and (4) Neutralizing the mismatch of the child's dialect to the printed page by avoiding the areas of potential mismatch in the teaching materials. Much rhetoric has filled the journals since this area of reading instruction was pointed out. It is time for a calm and just evaluation of these models in relationship to each other.

This need for better evaluative measurements also comes at a time when one of the emerging qualities of education is that it is getting more and more complicated. Perhaps this puts language education only slightly behind other fields such as sociology and psychology, but in the latter areas, it is becoming fashionable to assert exactly what it is that is not known on a given topic. This has produced curious problems when these disciplines intersect with education. For example, while linguists and psychologists now claim that we have no real theoretical evidence to support a program of native-language acquisition, educators are churning out programs for the disadvantaged based on the uncharted territory involving the influence of a parent's speech on his children or, alternately and even less convincing, on the influence of a surrogate

parent or teacher on a child's acquisition of his native language. If such programs were represented only as hypotheses to be tested, then implemented if shown to be effective, this would seem to be a reasonable procedure. But educational programs only infrequently admit as much. In matters such as this, it would behoove educators to assert what it is that they do not know on the urgent issues of our times. Social scientists have only recently discovered that by admitting their absence of knowledge they make themselves less popular but more useful. The social scientists have only recently come to realize that a crisis in confidence can come about from believing that things are too easy. If you think you know all there is to know about how to teach reading, manage an education system or preserve human dignity, you are apt to make much more serious mistakes than if you admit that you really do not have the solution at your finger tips.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Inventory of Materials to Teach Standard English

The following list shows our inventory of August 1, 1970. The materials listed are those of which we have samples. We have not listed materials mentioned in reports unless samples of the materials are included.

The list is divided into three sections: Primary, Secondary, and Adult. The entries include the following information (when it was mentioned or could reasonably be inferred):*

1. The author(s) of the materials and/or the project or school system where they were developed.
2. Title of program.
3. Other publication information: address of author(s) or publisher, date, place of development or publication.
4. A brief indication of the nature of the program: the teaching materials, the student population, and an indication of the teaching methodology.

The purpose of the survey is to determine what types of materials development have been done. Another problem is that of availability to those schools that wish to implement programs for teaching standard English. Inclusion on this list does not mean that the materials are available for distribution.

---

*An asterisk indicates that the earlier entry has been reviewed by the author(s) and that the changes have been incorporated in the present entry.

PRIMARY (K through 6)

1. Baltimore City Public Schools
Troy, Thomas; Lewis, Jeanette

Baltimore, Md.: Public Schools, n.d.

Teaching materials: tapes. These lessons for use in 4th, 5th, and 6th grades include dialogs and sentences for listening and repetition.

2. Chicago Board of Education*
Leaverton, Lloyd; Gladney, Mildred; Hoffman, Melvin J.; Patterson, Zoreda R.; Davis, Olga

Psycholinguistics Oral Language Program: A Bi-Dialectal Approach. Part I. (Experimental Edition). Chicago, Ill.: Board of Education, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher's manual. "The program was developed for those Afro-American children whose speech patterns differ from standard English. It consists of a variety of activities in which the informal speech patterns of the children are used as a starting point to introduce standard English. The terms EVERYDAY TALK and SCHOOL TALK are employed to help the children distinguish between the non-standard and standard forms."

3. Golden, Ruth I.; Martellock, Helen A.*

Golden Primary Language Lessons: Talking With Mike. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Spoken Arts, Inc., 1969.

Teaching materials: tapes and teacher's guide. These taped lessons for primary-school children include repeating activities, songs, poems, and riddles.

4. Grand Rapids Public Schools; Foreign Language Innovative Curricula Studies
(Jane Bonnell, Program Director)

Oral Language Guide: Primary One. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Public Schools, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher book. An "interdisciplinary approach" is used: the structures are presented through activities such as drills, games, and songs. There are activities related to aspects of the curriculum, such as reading and social studies. The students are "Black American children."

5. Hawaii, State of *
Sugai, Elaine E.; Sugano, Miyoko
Hawaii District, State of Hawaii Department of Education, P.O. Box 1922, Hilo, Hawaii 96720

Teaching Standard English as a Second Dialect to Primary School Children in Hilo, Hawaii. Appendix B: Teacher's Guide and Lessons. Hilo, Hawaii: State of Hawaii Department of Education, October 1969.

Teaching materials: teacher book. Audio-lingual training is provided through structured oral language lessons to teach standard English to speakers of the "Hawaii Islands Dialect" in grades K through 3.

6. Michigan Migrant Primary Interdisciplinary Project*
Robinett, Ralph F.; Benjamin, Richard C.
3800 Packard Road, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48104

English Guide: Kindergarten
Interdisciplinary Oral Language Guide: Primary One
Ann Arbor, Mich.: Migrant Interdisciplinary Project, 1970.

Teaching materials: teacher book. In these lessons, "basic concepts and processes...are integrated with linguistic features." The students are "primary age Spanish-background children who have limited control of standard English."

7. Philadelphia School District*
Street, Marion L.; Gerber, Adele

Televised Speech Improvement Series: Years 2 and 3; Years 4, 5, 6.
Philadelphia, Pa.: Philadelphia School District, 1967.

Teaching materials: teacher books; tele-taped programs. The specialized knowledge and techniques of speech education are used to teach standard speech in grades 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. The students use nonstandard speech.

8. Rystrom, Richard C.; Farris, Marjorie; Smith, Judy
University of Georgia, Research and Development Center in Educational Stimulation

Instructional Program in Standard English
Unit I: Teaching Standard-English Features
Unit II: Teaching the Singular Copula/Plural Marker
Unit III: Teaching Reduced Consonantal Clusters
Unit IV: Teaching the Modal "Will"
Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, August, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher books of drills and songs. Structured drills are based on oral pattern-practice and memorization. The student population is early elementary school children who speak "Negro dialect."

9. Shenkman, Harriet
Duke University, Durham Education Improvement Program, 2010 Campus Drive, Durham, N.C. 27706

A Language Program for Culturally Disadvantaged Children. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher's manual. The lessons introduce verbalization as the center of an activity and coordinate verbalization with motor, dramatic and visual skills. The students are "Negro of disadvantaged backgrounds", in K or first grade.

10. Southeastern Education Laboratory
(Azalia S. Francis, Principal Investigator)
3405 International Blvd., Atlanta, Ga. 30054

Multisensory Language Development Project. Atlanta, Ga.: Southeastern Education Laboratory, n.d.

Teaching materials: teacher books; student books. The procedure "seeks to provide...visual, auditory, tacital (sic), kenesthetic (sic) olfactory, and gustatory avenues of learning" for students who use "the uneducated speech of the school children of the Southeastern United States."

11. Taylor, Jane C.
Duke University, Durham Education Improvement Program, 2010 Campus Drive, Durham, N.C. 27706

A Manual of Speech Improvement Lessons for Culturally-Deprived Children. Durham, N.C.: Duke University, 1967.

Teaching materials: teacher book. The manual aims to provide daily lessons for speech stimulation and language in K. The students "ordinarily communicate in a dialect."

12. Thomas, Hadley A.; Allen, Harold B.*

Oral English: Learning a Second Language. Oklahoma City, Okla.: The Economy Company, 1968.

Teaching materials: pupil book; teacher book; charts and cards. The teaching method is audio-lingual. "The material was designed for use with young children (generally ages 4 through 8) whose native language is not English, but 'the program may also be used to advantage with children who speak non-standard dialects of English.'"

13. Torrey, Jane W.*
Connecticut College, Department of Psychology, New London, Conn. 06320

(no title)

Teaching materials: teacher instructions; pictures and text for students. Programmed instruction lessons are presented in oral and written form.

14. Wakulla County, Florida
Burks, Ann; Caskie, Polly
Wakulla County Oral Language Project, c/o Shadeville School, Route 2, Crawfordville, Florida

(no title)

Teaching materials: teacher book. The teaching method is basically pattern practice with games and other activities to make the students' speech "acceptable classroom speech."

SECONDARY (7 through 12)

15. Brandes, Paul
University of North Carolina, Department of English, Speech Division

(no title)

Teaching materials: pattern practice lessons; tapes. These lessons are based on pattern practice.

16. Center for Applied Linguistics*
Feigenbaum, Irwin

English Now. (Developmental Edition). New York, N.Y.: New Century, 1970.

Teaching materials: workbook; tapes; teacher's manual. This program uses structured drills and freer activities for increased proficiency in standard English. The students speak "Black nonstandard" English and are in grades 7 through 12.

17. Erickson, Jon L., ed.*
University of Wisconsin, Department of English, Programs in English Linguistics

Grammar Drills for the Teaching of Standard English as a Second Dialect. (Preliminary Edition). Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, 1965.

Teaching materials: teacher book. "The drills are designed to be used orally by a teacher trained in oral-aural instruction" to teach "standard English to speakers whose native dialects of English differ more or less significantly from the standard dialect."

18. Golden, Ruth I.*

The Golden Secondary Series: Learning American English. New Rochelle, N.Y.: Spoken Arts, Inc., 1970.

Teaching materials: tapes: teacher book. This program is primarily for junior high school students. It includes repetition drills and other exercises in a self-instructional form enlivened with music.

19. Hartford Public Schools
(Robert L. Twiss, General Editor, and Caroline D. Hamsher, Editor)
Professional Resources Center, Hartford, Conn. 06103

Pattern Practice in Standard American English. Hartford, Conn: Hartford Public Schools, June, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher book of drills. The lessons consist of oral pattern practice. They are for nonstandard speakers of English "in grades seven and eight, but they may appropriately be utilized in the upper grades as individual needs dictate."

20. Los Angeles City Schools*
a) Wilson, Marilyn

Standard Oral English: Instructional Guide A, 7th Grade.

b) Cockrell, Wilma; Johnson, Kenneth R.

Standard Oral English: Instructional Guide C, 10th Grade.

Los Angeles, Calif.: Los Angeles City Schools, 1967.

Teaching materials: teacher books; taped exercises. The lessons are based on pattern practice and consist of oral and written activities, both highly structured and less structured. They are for the Negro students who require drills and other activities in order to acquire standard English.

21. Luelsdorff, Philip A.

(no title)
Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin, Department of English, Programs in English Linguistics, 1969.

Teaching materials: teacher book. This program consists of pronunciation drills for speakers of "nonstandard Negro English" for secondary or adult students.

22. Philadelphia School District*
Steet, Marion L. et al.

Speech Improvement: Middle School.
Speech Improvement: Upper School.
Pattern Practice for Standard Usage and Pronunciation.
Philadelphia, Pa.: Philadelphia School District, 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher guides. These books contain drills for students in secondary schools. The approach is basically pattern practice dealing with "specific problems which are typical of local nonstandard speech."

23. Pittsburgh Public Schools*

Pattern Drills. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Pittsburgh Public Schools, April 15, 1967.

Teaching materials: teacher book of drills; charts. The lessons utilize aural-oral techniques in pattern drills. The students are 7th and 8th graders who speak nonstandard English.

24. Robinett, Ralph F.; Bell, Paul W.*

English: Target 1, The Space Visitors.
English: Target 2.
New York, N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1968.

Teaching materials: student books; teacher books. This program "provides the students with experiences related to listening-speaking, reading, writing." It is for 7th and 8th grade students "who habitually use linguistic features outside the range of standard usage." The reading level is 4th to 5th grade.

ADULT

25. The Adult Education Center, Inc.*
(Alice Geoffray, Director)
112 Exchange Place, New Orleans, La. 70130

Business Speech: A Second Language for Vocational Use. New Orleans, La.: Adult Education Center, Inc., n.d.

Teaching materials: workbook; teacher's manual. The teaching methodology "incorporates many of the principles of speech therapy and public speaking." The students are secretarial trainees "who regularly use nonstandard speech patterns."

26. American Institutes for Research*
Gropper, George L.; Short, Jerry G.; Glasgow, Zita

Job Corps Language Program. Pittsburgh, Pa.: American Institutes for Research, May, 1969.

Teaching materials: Administrative Manual; Diagnostic and Evaluative Tests; Tape Scripts; Corpsman Record Book; Corpsman Notebook. "On the basis of diagnosed deficiencies, these materials provide remedial training for Job Corpsmen."

27. Archibald, Barbara; Mentzer, Ann E.

Audio-Lingual English Series. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon Publishers, n.d.

Teaching materials: records; student books; teacher book. "Sequential drills on standard American English sentence patterns" supplement the regular English program to teach "a new language -- one [the students] can use in addition to the language with which they are already familiar." The program is "not limited to any particular grade or achievement level."

28. Ecroyd, Donald H.
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

"Speech Training Aspects of the Dialect Remediation Project:" Appendix A (pp. 140-164). In: Center for Community Studies [of] Temple University and Berean Institute, The Dialect Remediation Project, Final Report... Philadelphia, Pa.: Temple University and Berean Institute, 1965-1966.

Teaching materials. tapes: teacher book. The training is for "language remediation" using "programmed tapes" and "normal classroom methods." The students are training for secretarial positions.

29. Gomez, Alice
Chicago City College (Loop Campus), English Department

Pattern Drills in Standard English. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago City College, August, 1968.

Teaching materials: tapescript or teacher-led drills: study sheets. The drills are the basis for oral pattern practice "for improvement in the nonstandard language patterns of speakers of American English." The students are college freshmen.

30. Hurst, Charles G., Jr.

Higher Horizons in Speech Communication. Boston, Mass.: General Electronic Laboratories, Inc., 1968.

Teaching materials: teacher book; student books; tapes. The program consists of listening, speaking and writing activities. The students speak "non-standard English."

31. Lin, San-su C.*

Pattern Practice in the Teaching of Standard English to Students with a Non-Standard Dialect. New York, N.Y.: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.

Teaching materials. tapes: teacher book. A modified pattern practice methodology is recommended for college freshmen.

Three documents are included as addenda to Appendix I. The documents describe materials development undertakings in three different areas of the country.

Frances, W. Nelson (Director). Final Report. Brown-Tougaloo English Language Project, 1965-1969. Providence, R.I.: Brown University, July, 1970.

Garvey, Catherine and Baldwin, Thelma. A Self-Instructional Program in Standard English: Development and Evaluation. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, The Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, September, 1969.

Holt, Grace S. An Ethnolinguistic Approach to Language Learning for Minority Group Children. Chicago: Northeastern Illinois State College, Center for Inner City Studies, 1969.

APPENDIX II

Evaluation Instrument

1. ADMINISTRATION

I. Materials

A. Package

1. What does the program consist of? What are the components? amount of each? Is there optional material?

2. How much does the package cost? the individual parts? Are parts reusable?

B. Production and availability

1. Where can this program be found?

2. Who are the developers? Where was the development done?

3. Is there other pertinent information about development or publication available?

II. Students and Teacher

A. Students

1. What age or grade level? reading level?

2. What dialect(s) of English do the students speak?

3. How is entering performance stated? linguistically? cognitively? other?

4. Is there a way of diagnosing student problems? a way of selecting the students? pre-test? teacher's impressions?

B. Teacher

1. What training or competencies are assumed or needed?

2. How closely does the program guide or control the teacher? How much teacher preparation for the lessons?

3. What direction for further reading or study is suggested?

III. Classroom Use

A. Distribution (time and content)

1. How much coursework time is provided in the materials? How is this time distributed? daily; weekly; etc.

2. How many units (lessons, etc.) are there? What are the linguistic topics of the units?

B. Student interaction with materials

1. Is the interaction student-teacher? self-instructional?

2. Is the teaching in groups? whole class? individuals?

3. How is the work to be integrated with the other work in the curriculum?

2. OBJECTIVES, TESTS, EVALUATION

I. Objectives

A. What they are

1. What is/are the overall objective(s)? What connection is there between the overall objective(s) and the approach to teaching: the rationale?

2. What specific objectives are stated? in terms of which skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening)?

B. How they are stated

1. Are the objectives stated in terms of measurable behaviors?

2. How is the teacher to check the students' achievement of the objectives?

II. Tests

A. Pre- and Post-

1. How is the students' entering proficiency to be determined? Is there provision for determining the individual student's mastery of specific standard English features?

2. How is the students' proficiency to be measured after the instruction?

B. Progress through the program

1. Where is testing included within the program? unit-final? after several units?

2. What type of tests are included? individual features? cumulative throughout the program?

III. Evaluation (trials)

A. Trials

1. Under what conditions has the program been tried?

2. Is there a report? where?

B. Revision

1. Which version is this? final, preliminary?

2. What provision is there for feedback to the author(s), publisher?

3. CONTENT

I. Linguistic

A. Linguistic features

1. What types of linguistic features are included? some examples.

2. How was selection of features done?

3. Is there a scheme for the order? Does the program tell?

B. Sociolinguistic

1. What oral style(s) is/are used? Is there a distinction between oral and written styles?

2. Is there a stated relationship between the students' language and the target language?

II. Nonlinguistic

A. Nonlinguistic material to be taught

1. What other material, information, or skills are to be taught?

2. How are they grouped and/or ordered? Does the program tell?

B. Vehicle for instruction

1. What subject matters are used to carry the instruction?

4. PEDAGOGY

I. Overall Approach

A. Methodology

1. What is the approach used? (second-language; language development). What are some of the more common types of teaching activities or drills? in typical order, if there is one.

2. What provision is made for carryover outside the context of instruction in standard English?

B. Adaptation

1. What provision is made to account for student differences? Can students with different skills (from class to class or within a class) use the material differently?

2. What types of activities provide the additional or different use? (repetition of activities; supplementary activities)

II. Specific Learning Activities

A. Directed from teacher or materials to student; no student response (list several examples)

B. Directed between teacher/materials and student; controlled student response (list several examples)

C. Initiated by student; no control once activity has begun (list several examples)

III. Use of Students' Dialect

A. Contrastive linguistics (in materials preparation)

B. For interest (list several instances)

C. Contrast or exemplification (feature by feature) (list several activities)

D. Translation or generation (list several activities)

5. QUALITY CONTROL

I. Text Materials

A. Design

1. Is the text attractive? legible? durable?

2. Are the response formats clear? What to do? Criterion (criteria) of correctness? When response is correct or not?

B. Content

1. Are the samples of standard English correct and appropriate?

2. Are the samples of the students' dialect correct and appropriate?

3. Are the statements about language accurate?

II. Other Materials (tapes, pictures, etc.)

A. Design

1. Is it attractive? durable? clear?

2. Are they easy to use? What kind are they? (Are they reel-to-reel tapes? slides in color? etc.)

3. Is the correspondence to the text accurate?

B. Content

1. Is the material accurate?

2. Is the material appropriate to the content to be illustrated?

6. AFFECT

I. Addressed to Teacher

A. Student population

1. How are the students described? What is the problem?

2. How is the students' language described generally? named?

B. Linguistic Premises

1. What premises? about language; about English?

2. What premise about relationship between students' language and target language?

C. Pedagogical Premises

1. What premises about the way to teach the material?

2. What premises about the way to teach the students?

D. Teacher background

1. What preparation and attitude is required or suggested for this instruction?

2. What type(s) of further reading is/are suggested? (linguistics? sociology? language teaching?)

II. Addressed to Students

A. Linguistic

1. What names are used for the target dialect and the students' dialect?

2. Is the students' dialect used in the instruction? In what types of activities is it used? and for what purposes?

3. What are the students told about language?

B. Content

1. What subject matters are used? What cultural settings?

2. What special terminology is introduced as part of the language pedagogy?

APPENDIX III

Applications of the Evaluation Instrument

Although the major thrust of this project's work has been the description of what has been done in the way of materials development, it seemed worthwhile to show the use of the document in more complete descriptions of several programs. In this way, the reader will gain a better perspective of the types of information provided and how these types of information combine to provide an overall picture of the program described.

Two programs have been selected for description, one on the elementary level and one on the secondary level. There is no implication of quality in the selection of the two programs: the programs were not chosen because they seemed especially good or particularly poor. They were chosen for other reasons. The secondary program was chosen because it seemed to come close to typifying many of the programs that rely entirely or almost entirely on pattern practice techniques. Many of the questions of the questionnaire/outline are unanswered because the aspects of the program they investigate do not appear in the particular package under examination; this is also true of many of the other programs relying on pattern practice. The elementary program was selected because it uses the students' nonstandard dialect as a part of the pedagogy. Although only a few of the programs utilize the students' language in the pedagogy, it seemed interesting to look at one of these programs in detail.

Again, it is important to state that we intend no implication of quality judgment in describing the two programs; although we may have our own preferences for types of materials to be used in different teaching contexts, we do not intend to imply that any one approach is the only possible one.

A. PSYCHOLINGUISTICS ORAL LANGUAGE PROGRAM - A BI-DIALECTAL APPROACH

ADMINISTRATION

I. Materials

A. Package

1. What does the program consist of? How many components are there (i.e. teacher's manual, student texts, tapes, records)? How long is each component (i.e. number of pages, tape reels or cassettes)? Are some components optional?

This entire program is contained in a 188 page teacher's manual. In addition, there are suggested activities that involve the use of a tape recorder (p. 46). While this program was developed in conjunction with a Psycholinguistics Reading Series, the authors do not specify that the two are to be used together.

2. How much does the program cost? Are prices listed for individual parts? Are some parts reusable?

While no price is given, the program is available through ERIC microfishe for $0.75. The manual is reusable.

B. Production and Publication

1. How can the program be obtained?

This manual was copyrighted by the Chicago Public Schools in 1968 (title page) and is also available through ERIC. (See A.2.)

2. Who developed this material? Where?

The program was developed for the Chicago Public Schools by Lloyd Leaverton, Educational Psychologist, Mildred R. Gladney, Primary Teacher, and Melvin J. Hoffman, Structural Linguist. Two additional primary teachers, Zoreda R. Patterson and Olga J. Davis, used the materials in the early experimental stages and helped with later revisions (title page and "A Model for Teaching Standard English to Non-standard English Speakers", see item 3, below).

3. Is there any other pertinent information about development or publication available?

Some aspects of the development are described in "A Model for Teaching Standard English to Non-standard English Speakers" by Mildred R. Gladney and Lloyd Leaverton, available from Lloyd Leaverton, Chicago Public Schools. This paper was read at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1968.

II. Students and Teachers

A. Students

1. What age or grade level were these materials written for? Is it necessary to know the students' reading level?

While no age, grade, or reading level is specified in the introduction, the first language elicitation lesson is built around a description of a kindergarten or first grade teacher (p. 8). Later in lesson 18 the teacher is told to put a chart showing the distribution of is/am/are on the board and "encourage the children to use the chart as a reference during class work and during independent work" (p. 31). Lesson 23, entitled "Sentences as Independent Work," instructs the children to translate sentences written in one dialect into the other as a written exercise (p. 45). Note that both lessons 18 and 23 are supplemental. The Psycholinguistic Reading Series, written in conjunction with this program (see Sec. I, A.1), is intended as a basal reader (teacher's manual p. 7).

2. What dialect(s) of English do the students entering this program speak?

"The minority dialect that the staff is most interested in is that of the Afro-American child who comes from a community in which the language used differs from the standard English" (p. 2).

3. How is entering performance stated? Linguistically? Cognitively? Other?

Entering performance is stated linguistically in terms of grammatical features (pp. 2-3).

B. Teachers

1. What special training or competencies are assumed?

None are mentioned.

2. How closely does the program guide or control the teacher?

In the introduction there are three pages of "General Guidelines" (pp. 5-7). Within the lessons themselves specific guidelines are given for language elicitation, but no guides are given for the amount of time that should be spent on drill. "The rate of progress of the class as a whole in understanding and applying the ideas determine the amount of time to be spent on each lesson" (p. 6). Optional drills and suggestions for ways in which students can practice "school talk" are given at the end of each unit. The following recommendation is made for moving on to the next unit: "when the majority of the children are ready

to move ahead ... you introduce the activities of the next unit to the entire class and form small instruction groups for those children who need additional practice" (p. 47).

3. What direction for further reading or study is suggested?

A three-page "selected" bibliography is listed in the back of the manual (pp. 179-181).

III. Classroom Use

A. Time and Content Distribution

1. How much time should be provided for the use of these materials? How is the time distributed (i.e. daily, weekly, total time)?

"At least fifteen to twenty minutes a day should be devoted to the lessons. The rate of progress of the class as a whole in understanding and applying the ideas determines the amount of time to be spent on each lesson" (p. 6).

2. How many units are there? What topics do these units cover? What portion of the lessons within each unit are basic? Supplemental?

Distinctions between basic and supplemental or review lessons are not made by the authors. However, each unit has a number of lessons devoted to specific grammatical features and a number which review all the features in the unit, either separately or in combination.

Unit I	AM - IS - ARE	24 lessons: 17 basic, 7 supplemental/review
Unit II	WAS - WERE	17 lessons: 10 basic, 7 supplemental/review
Unit III	"-S" - "-ES"	18 lessons: 11 basic, 7 supplemental/review
Unit IV	SAY - SAYS	13 lessons: 6 basic, 7 supplemental/review
Unit V	DO - DOES	18 lessons: 11 basic, 7 supplemental/review
Unit VI	HAVE - HAS	13 lessons: 6 basic, 7 supplemental/review

Pronunciation Practices: (p/f, b/v, th/t, th/d, th/f, th/v, m/n), 6 pages

B. Student Interaction with Materials

1. How much time is devoted to student-teacher interaction? How much of the material is self-instructional or work that can be done independently, once explained by the teacher?

All the material requires student-teacher interaction except portions of those supplemental lessons built around distribution charts and written translation exercises (see Sec. 2, A.1).

2. Is the teaching done in small groups? With the whole class? With individuals?

The teaching for each unit begins with the entire class. Later the teacher may put students who need more practice in small groups (p. 47).

3. How is this work to be integrated with other work in the curriculum?

The basic lessons are not integrated with anything else, since neither this program, nor the Psycholinguistics Reading Series state that the two are to be used together. However, one supplemental lesson in each unit contains examples of ways in which the grammatical features of that unit can be incorporated into science and social studies lessons.

OBJECTIVES, TESTS, EVALUATION

I. Objectives

A. What They Are

1. What are the overall objectives? What connection is there between the overall objectives and the approach to teaching (the rationale)?

The authors are concerned with modifying the language of "those children whose established speech patterns differ from the standard English" (specifically Afro-American children) because "modification ... is necessary to enable the child to advance economically and socially in the dominant society." "Constant correction," used by many teachers, lacks the "rigorous systemization" necessary "in view of the complexity of the task the child faces in learning the standard English" and is also "ineffective because of the emotional significance the (his) established speech patterns have to the child." Because of this, the authors have tried to develop "an approach that would emphasize and utilize the child's existing language competency as a starting point and then gradually and systematically introduce the standard English as an additional dialect." Differences in vocabulary and pronunciation have been judged to be less crucial than differences in grammar.

2. What specific objectives are stated? Are they stated in terms of specific skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing)?

"The child is engaged in learning a new dialect ... it is not to be expected that the child will relinquish his own dialect in the area of verb forms. ... what is expected ... is that he becomes sensitive to the standard patterns to the degree that he recognizes them in comparison to his own and he develops the facility of using the standard patterns ... on demand" (p.7).

B. How They Are Stated

1. Are the objectives stated in terms of measurable behavior?

The objectives are measurable in the sense that performance tests could be created.

2. How is the teacher to check the students' achievement of the objectives? Are tests provided?

The teacher decides when the child has mastered a given set of forms without the aid of any specified testing device. Although the general guidelines state that each child will be asked to produce the standard forms, here called SCHOOL TALK, at the end of each unit, the units seem to list this as an optional activity (pp. 4, 46).

II. Tests

A. Pre- and Post-

1. How is the students' entering proficiency to be determined? Is there provision for determining the individual student's mastery of specific standard English features prior to their beginning a unit which contains them?

No provision is made for pretesting of either group or individual proficiency of students described as Afro-Americans who come from "a community in which the language used differs from the standard English," apparently under the assumption that all children living in such a community will find the program beneficial (p.2).

2. How is the students' proficiency to be measured after the instruction?

The teacher is to evaluate the students' progress (p. 47). No formal testing program is provided.

III. Evaluation

A. Trials

1. Under what conditions has the program been tried?

The teacher's manual does not describe the development of this program. However, the activities of experimental and control groups are described in "A model for Teaching Standard English to Non-standard Speakers."

2. Is there a report available? How can it be obtained?

Contact Lloyd Leaverton, Chicago Public Schools, for "A Model for Teaching Standard English to Non-standard Speakers" by Mildred R. Gladney and Lloyd Leaverton, originally read at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1968.

B. Revision

1. Which version is this (final, preliminary)?

This is labeled an Experimental Edition.

2. What provision is there for feedback to the author(s) or publisher?

No provision is stated in the manual, presumably because the material was designed for use within the Chicago school system.

CONTENT

I. Linguistic

A. Linguistic Features

1. What types of linguistic features are included?

The linguistic features included are a selected set of contrasting verb forms with their appropriate subjects: IS/AM/ARE, WAS/WERE, the presence and absence of the third singular present tense inflection in general, SAY/SAYS, DO/DOES, HAVE/HAS.

2. How were decisions made for inclusion or exclusion?

The authors decided to concentrate on grammatical features on the following basis. "Differing vocabulary was eliminated from consideration because of its short-lived nature and its great variation regionally. In considering pronunciation and grammar, the staff felt that in American Society there is less toleration of grammatical differences than of pronunciation differences" (p. 2). While no reason is given for restricting the scope of the lessons to verb forms, the authors acknowledge that they have done so (pp. 2, 7).

3. How are the features grouped or ordered?

Since the general ordering of items within each of the units listed above is quite similar, a detailed examination of one unit should be a sufficient indication of how all the units are organized.

Unit I AM - IS - ARE

Lesson 1 Is with she
Lesson 2 Is with she, he, it
Lesson 3 Noun/pronoun subject substitutions for is
Lesson 4 Am with I
Lesson 5 Am with I/ he, she, and it with is
Lesson 6 Is/am with present participle (-ing verb form)

Lesson 7 Is/am going to
Lesson 8 Is/am in questions
Lesson 9 Negation of is/am and corresponding use of ain't
Lesson 10 Review of noun/pronoun subject substitutions for is/am
Lesson 11 Are with pronoun subjects
Lesson 12 Distribution of is/am/are and appropriate subjects
Lesson 13 Are with present participle (-ing verb form)
Lesson 14 Future, are going to
Lesson 15 Are in questions
Lesson 16 Negation of are and corresponding use of ain't
Lesson 17 Noun/pronoun subjects of are
Lesson 18-24 Supplemental and review

Drills involving questions and negation are given for all verbs except those in the unit on the third singular, present tense inflection and have/has.

B. Sociolinguistic

1. What oral style(s) is/are used? Is a distinction made between oral and written styles?

No distinction is made. In many instances, children are taught both the full and the reduced (contracted) verb forms.

2. Is there a stated relationship between the students' language and the goal language?

Yes. The native language (dialect), here called EVERYDAY TALK, is for use "when we're just talking about anything and to anyone," when "not thinking about school or school work," or "when we're just talking with our friends and our parents." The goal language (dialect), called SCHOOL TALK, is for use "in school especially and outside of school, too" (pp. 8, 54).

II. Nonlinguistic

A. Nonlinguistic Material to be Taught

1. What other material (information or skills) are to be taught?

None specifically, although the various grammatical features may be incorporated in science and social studies lessons (Supplementary units).

2. How are they grouped and/or ordered?

No grouping or ordering.

B. Vehicle for Instruction: What subject matter is used to carry the instruction?

In most instances, the instruction is incorporated into short narratives about things the child is likely to be familiar with, either in school, or at home, or in the community.

PEDAGOGY

I. Overall Approach

A. Methodology

1. What approach is used (second language, language development)? What are the more common types of teaching activities and drills? Does their use follow a sequential pattern?

The basic lessons utilize a combination of second language and language development techniques. Each lesson begins with the teacher telling (or reading) a short narration and asking the children questions about it. These questions are supposed to elicit responses with the desired sentence patterns. The teacher makes a note only of those responses which fit the desired patterns. Then the teacher reads through the list asking the students which are EVERYDAY TALK and which are SCHOOL TALK, as well as asking for the appropriate translation for each item. In some of the later lessons, the teacher simply reads statements in SCHOOL or EVERYDAY TALK, and asks the students to translate. Teachers are instructed to provide practice in both full and reduced (contracted) forms of is/am/are--especially dual negative forms (i.e. she's not/she isn't), and negatives of was/were, and does/do. No other reduced forms are mentioned. Some of the basic lessons also provide completion drills, in which the teacher will give a subject and the student will give the corresponding verb, and substitution drills, in which the teacher will give a pronoun subject and the student will give a noun subject (or the reverse).

The supplementary lessons for each unit include: a distribution chart, review sentences for translation drills, narratives in EVERYDAY TALK for class discussion and translation practice, rhymed pattern practice drills which can be sung, dialogs in SCHOOL TALK (sometimes with both full and reduced forms), written translation exercises, topics for additional practice in SCHOOL TALK, and applications to science and social studies lessons.

2. What provision is made for carryover outside the context of instruction in Standard English?

The only provisions made for carryover are in the suggestions for utilizing the grammatical features of the units in science and social studies.

B. Adaptation

1. What provision is made to account for student differences? Can students with different skills (from class to class or within a class) use the material differently?

The authors suggest that the children in a given class begin each unit together. They also suggest that children needing additional practice in a previous unit be put in small groups at a separate

time (p. 47). Any other flexibility in the program, either for the class as a whole or for individuals, must be provided by the teacher.

2. What types of activities (repetition or supplemental) provide for additional or different use?

The teacher is free to repeat the basic units and/or to use the supplemental review material.

II. Specific Learning Activities

A. Are learning activities directed from teacher or materials to the students, with no response from the students (i.e. grammatical generalizations)?

Definitions of what constitutes the standard dialect (SCHOOL TALK) as provided by the text are presented by the teacher to the students during the class discussions.

B. Are there activities directed between the teacher/materials and the students, with controlled student responses?

The responses of the students to the narrations and the translation exercises fall into this category.

C. Are there activities initiated by the student, with no teacher control once the activity has begun?

The topics listed as additional practice in SCHOOL TALK can be used this way.

III. Use of Students' Dialect

A. Contrastive linguistics; C. Contrast or exemplification, and D. Translation or generation -- all seem to be the same question (at least as far as this material is concerned).

The features are listed under CONTENT, I, A., 1 and 3, and their utilization under PEDAGOGY, I., A., 1.

B. Interest.

This is a secondary consideration with this material.

QUALITY CONTROL

I. Text Materials

A. Design

1. Is the text attractive, legible, and durable?

Since this is a manual for teachers, not to be used by students, it is sufficiently attractive and legible. However, the covers and the binding are likely to pull apart.

2. Are the response formats clear? Do they indicate exactly what is to be done: what criteria are to be used for determining whether a response is correct or not?

During the language elicitation sessions, all responses are to be encouraged..."whether the response is a desired one or not and particularly if it is not" (p. 6). The teacher is given specific directions as to the types of responses to make note of. Beyond that, the teacher's knowledge of standard English is the criterion used.

B. Content

1. Are the samples of standard English correct and appropriate?
2. Are the samples of the students' dialect correct and appropriate?

These questions are best answered together, since some misinformation occurs in translation. Standard English have is given as a translation for nonstandard got in sentences where most standard speakers would use a reduced (contracted) form of have got ("I got a bike/I have a bike") and in sentences where many Black children would use have rather than got or have got ("I got a headache/I have a headache") (p. 150). The relationship between have and have got in standard English and the relationship between have and got in the dialects of many Black children are so complex that any attempt to teach their usage is bound to oversimplify, however. Most of the samples in both dialects are correct and appropriate.

3. Are statements about language and non-standard dialects accurate?

Most of the statements about language and dialect are made in the introduction and are not misleading (pp. 2-3).

II. Other Materials

None.

AFFECT

I. Addressed to Teachers

A. Student Population

1. How are the students described? What is the problem?

"...the Afro-American child who comes from a community in which the language used differs from the standard English" (p. 2).

2. How is the students' language described and named?

The students' language, labeled EVERYDAY TALK, is described as a legitimate facet of his community.

B. Linguistic Premises

1. What linguistic premises are utilized?

In addition to those listed under CONTENT, I., the authors' list of "major grammatical differences in the area of verb forms" (pp. 2-3) has to be based on the premise that these differences can be listed.

2. Is account taken of variations which occur in style and corresponding appropriateness of usage in different situations?

The students' native dialect (EVERYDAY TALK) is defined as one used "when we're just talking about anything and to anyone" or "when we're just talking with our friends and our parents." Standard English (SCHOOL TALK) is defined as that which is "used in school especially and outside of school, too" (pp. 8, 54).

C. What pedagogical premises are utilized?

The authors state that teachers frequently fail to teach standard English because "Constant correction without rigorous systemization is not effective...in view of the complexity of task the child faces in learning standard English." And because they do not take into account "the emotional significance the (his) established speech patterns have to the child." "The lessons are organized to prevent errors of distribution." "During the lessons valued words such as 'right/wrong,' 'correct/incorrect' are not needed." "The teacher must always accept a child's response with a positive comment" (pp. 1-2).

D. Teacher Background

1. What preparation and attitudes are suggested for this instruction?

No specific preparation is suggested. The attitudes are described above in section C.

2. What type(s) of further reading is/are suggested (linguistics, sociology, language teaching)?

The three-page bibliography at the end of the manual (pp. 179-181) is a mixture of articles by linguists, psychologists, and educators.

II. Addressed to Students

A. Linguistic

1. What names are used for the target dialect and the students' dialect?

The target dialect is called SCHOOL TALK and the students' dialect, EVERYDAY TALK.

2. Is the students' dialect used in the instruction? In what types of activities and for what purposes?

See PEDAGOGY I., A., 1.

3. What is he told about language?

See CONTENT, I. B., 2.

B. Content

1. What subject matters are used? What cultural settings?

See CONTENT, II., B.

2. What special terminology is introduced as part of the language pedagogy?

See A., 1., above.

B. PITTSBURGH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Pattern Drills. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Pittsburgh Public Schools, April 15, 1967.

Glassner, Leonard E., Program Evaluator. Pattern Drills Program: 1967 Report. Pittsburgh, Pa.: Pittsburgh Public Schools, 1967.

ADMINISTRATION

I. Materials

A. Package

1. What does the program consist of? What are the components? Is there optional material?

The book of pattern drills has 81 pages of drills and a 3-page table of contents. There is no optional material. (Some of the information in the description of the program comes from the 1967 Report, but the Report is not a part of the instructional package.) Charts are mentioned in the Report, but we do not have them in our inventory.

2. How much does the package cost? the individual parts? Are parts reusable?

No pricing information is included in either of the two books mentioned above. The materials were developed for use in certain schools in Pittsburgh, without any apparent view to making them generally available. The book of drills and the charts are reusable.

B. Production and availability

1. Where can this program be found?

Pittsburgh Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15213

2. Who are the developers? Where was the development done?

The development was done by the Office of Research, Pittsburgh Public Schools, under the guidance of the linguistics consultant, Ann T. Anthony.

3. Is there other pertinent information about development or publication available?

There is a 1967 Report which describes the development of the materials and their use in the schools. Bibliographical information about the Report is given above.

II. Students and Teacher

A. Students

1. What age or grade level? reading level?

The students are in seventh and eighth grade. No reading level is mentioned.

2. What dialect(s) of English do they speak?

The students "typically use non-standard phonetic and grammatical speech patterns." (Report, p. 10-2)

3. How is entering performance stated? linguistically? cognitively? other?

The students' entering behavior is stated linguistically. See previous question and answer.

4. Is there a way of diagnosing student problems? a way of selecting the students? pre-test? teacher's impressions?

The program provides no way of selecting the students: "Students served by the program include all those enrolled in grades 7 and 8 in participating schools." (Report, p. 10-4)

B. Teacher

1. What training or competencies are assumed or needed?

The classroom teachers "must have as basic qualifications the ability to speak standard English and at least minimal knowledge of the purposes and techniques of pattern drills." (Report, p. 10-7).

2. How closely does the program guide or control the teacher? How much teacher preparation for the lessons?

As expected in a program that is based on oral pattern practice, this program provides the substance for the lessons, but it does not specify the steps for class presentation.

3. What direction for further reading or study is suggested?

There is no suggestion for further reading or study.

III. Classroom Use

A. Distribution (time and content)

1. How much coursework time is provided in the materials? How is the time distributed? daily; weekly, etc.

The drills were used from "a few minutes" to "twenty to thirty minutes per drill" up to a frequency of daily use. (Report, pp. 10-14 -- 10-15)

2. How many units (lessons, etc.) are there? What are the linguistic topics of the units?

46 drills on be; 8 drills on "-s forms of verbs"; 3 drills on a/an; 9 drills on "negative forms" (anybody, somebody, nobody); 14 drills on "interdentals."

B. Student interaction with materials

1. Is the interaction student-teacher? self-instructional?

The interaction is student-teacher.

2. Is the teaching in groups? whole class? individuals?

There is no statement about the size of the student group.

3. How is the work to be integrated with the other work in the curriculum?

There is no direct answer to this question; however, the Report contains the responses to questions "to determine the compatibility of the program with the program environment." (Report, pp. 10-13 -- 10-20)

OBJECTIVES, TESTS, EVALUATION

I. Objectives

A. What they are

1. What is/are the overall objective(s)? What connection is there between the overall objective(s) and the approach to teaching: rationale?

Two terminal objectives are listed: 1) "Be able to communicate clearly with all speakers of English" and 2) "Be able to shift automatically from non-standard to standard speech and vice-versa as the situation requires." (Report, p. 10-5)

The following statement approaches a rationale for the teaching methodology: "Oral control of a language is established by repetition. The Pattern Drill materials provide opportunity for such repetition through pattern practice exercises." (Report, p. 10-46)

2. What specific objectives are stated? in terms of which skills (reading, writing, speaking, listening)?

No specific objectives are listed for this program.

B. How they are stated

1. Are the objectives stated in terms of measurable behaviors?

The Report states an awareness of the need to restate the objectives in terms of "specific student behavior." (Report, p. 10-35)

2. How is the teacher to check the students' achievement of the objectives?

The Report mentions that, although testing is important, the only testing available is done "informally through occasional test drills." (Report, p. 10-85)

II. Tests

A. Pre- and Post-

There is no pre- and post-testing in this program.

B. Progress through the program

1. Where is testing included within the program? unit-final? after several units?

Testing is unit-final except in one case of unit-medial as well as unit-final testing and five cases of no unit testing (taken from table of contents in Pattern Drills).

2. What types of tests are included? individual features? cumulative throughout the program?

The tests are cumulative within a unit or section but not throughout the program.

III. Evaluation (trials)

A. Trials

1. Under what conditions has the program been tried?

In 1966-67, the drills were taught to all seventh- and eighth-graders in 20 schools qualifying for ESEA funds. The program began in two schools in February, 1967, and expanded as materials became available and teachers received in-service training. (Report, p. 10-1)

2. Is there a report? Where?

The report was put out by the Pittsburgh Public Schools (bibliographical information above).

B. Revision

1. Which version is this? final? preliminary?

There is no indication of the version except for the date of April 15, 1967.

2. What provision is there for feedback to author(s)? publisher?

There were informal meetings during the development of the lessons. At these meetings and at in-service sessions, feedback could be gained. (Report, p. 10-10)

CONTENT

I. Linguistic

A. Linguistic features

1. What types of linguistic features are included? some examples

The drills include grammatical as well as phonological features; for example, "-s forms of verbs," "negative forms" (any, anybody, etc.), a/an, and "interdentals."

2. How was selection of features done?

The linguistic consultant interviewed students and indicated those differences between standard and nonstandard English to be included in the drills. (Appendix B of Report)

3. Is there a scheme for the order? Does the program tell?

There is no apparent scheme for the order of the features to be taught; the Report and the Pattern Drills mention none.

B. Sociolinguistic

1. What oral style(s) is/are used? Is there a distinction between oral and written styles?

Although a bi-dialectalism is mentioned as an objective, the only English in the drills is standard speech of the Pittsburgh area.

2. Is there a stated relationship between the students' language and the target language?

The students' language is treated as a separate system, and the project is designed "to emphasize the criterion of appropriateness to the situation." (Report, p. 10-46)

II. Nonlinguistic

A. Nonlinguistic material to be taught

There is no nonlinguistic material to be taught in this program.

B. Vehicle for instruction

The vehicle for instruction is general; there is no particular subject matter vehicle.

PEDAGOGY

I. Overall Approach

A. Methodology

1. What is the approach used? (second-language; language development). What are some of the more common types of teaching activities or drills? in typical order, if there is one.

"Pattern practice exercises, designed for automatic oral control, require repetition of model sentences with lexical substitutions within parts of the grammatical structure while the structure itself remains constant." (Report, p. 10-47). There are also some drills which require more complex manipulations than simple substitutions. No "typical order" is apparent.

2. What provision is made for carryover outside the context of instruction in standard English?

The materials consist of drills; there is no provision for carryover.

B. Adaptation

The materials do not provide for any adaptation to individual student differences.

II. Specific Learning Activities

A. Directed from teacher or materials to student; no student response

In the presentation stages of "minimal pair drills" and repetition exercises, the teacher might not require any response from the students.

B. Directed between teacher/materials and student; controlled student response.

The bulk of the instruction involves this type of instruction. Such activities include "substitution drills," other manipulation drills, and "repetition drills."

C. Initiated by student; no control once activity has begun.

There is no example of this type of activity in the program.

III. Use of Students' Dialect

A. Contrastive linguistics (in materials preparation).

A "bi-dialectal comparison" formed "the basis for the construction of exercises." (Report, p. 10-47)

B. For interest
C. Contrast or exemplification
D. Translation or generation

The students' dialect is not used in any of these three ways.

QUALITY CONTROL

I. Text Materials

A. Design

1. Is the text attractive? legible? durable?

The text is xerox copies of typewritten pages. It is legible and is durable if the pages are put into a notebook or other sturdy binder.

2. Are the response formats clear? What to do? Criterion (criteria) of correctness? when response is correct?

The presentation and instruction is entirely in the teacher's control; the students have no texts. Therefore, the response formats depend on the teacher's control of aural/oral methodology.

B. Content

1. Are the samples of standard English correct and appropriate?

The samples of standard English seem reasonable within the context of the instruction.

2. Are the samples of the students' dialect correct and appropriate?

There are no samples of the students' dialect in the program.

3. Are the statements about language correct?

There are no statements about language in the instruction.

II. Other Materials

We do not have copies of the charts mentioned in the Report. Therefore, we cannot answer the corresponding questions.

AFFECT

I. Addressed to Teacher

A. Student population

The materials do not include material addressed to the teacher; presumably the in-service sessions provided the needed information. The Report describes the students and the required teacher attitudes, but this information is not included in the program.

B. Linguistic premises

1. What premises? about language, about English?

Although not stated in any introductory material, it is clear that the materials development was based on the notion that language is patterned and that language usage is governed by the criterion of appropriateness.

2. What premise about relationship between students' language and target language?

The Report states that the two are treated as distinct systems insofar as possible, but this does not necessarily come out in the instruction.

C. Pedagogical premises

1. What premises about the way to teach the material?

The pattern practice approach used in this program relies heavily on repetition. There is the assumption that this is necessary to teach new language skills.

2. What premises about the way to teach the students?

Nothing is mentioned about the way to teach the students.

D. Teacher background

Teacher background is treated in description in the Report. There is the statement that the teacher must be able to control standard English and be able to teach using aural-oral methodology.

II. Addressed to Students

The materials consist entirely of drill work. The teacher could introduce the notion of appropriateness and discuss dialects of English and the English language, but the materials have nothing included. The subject matter is general.

APPENDIX IV

CENTER FOR APPLIED LINGUISTICS 1717 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Survey of Programs/Courses in Sociolinguistics and Urban Education

Institution _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Name of Department, Committee, etc. _____

Chairman or Executive Officer _____

Term system: Quarter _____ Semester _____ Trimester _____ Other (specify) _____

1. Do you offer a degree program in sociolinguistics, urban/social dialects, urban education, etc.? Yes _____ No _____

2. If yes, name degree offered and exact title, e.g. MAT in Urban Education.

3. Name of person in charge of program if different from Department Chairman, above.

4. COURSES. (Space is provided for 6 course résumés. If additional space is required, please attach supplementary sheets.)

(a) Course title _____

Description _____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

(b) Course title _____

Description _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

_____

(c) Course title _____

Description _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

_____

(d) Course title _____

Description _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

_____

(e) Course title _____

Description _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

_____

(f) Course title _____

Description _____

_____

_____

_____

Number of credit hours _____ Graduate ( ) Undergraduate ( )

Approximate number of students per term _____

Prerequisites _____

_____

5. Required text material, suggested reading lists, etc. for above courses. (List titles or attach list.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6. Opportunities for field work and/or practice teaching. (Give brief description. If offered as part of a course named in 4, above, please indicate. For practice teaching, include title of K - 12 text material.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. FACULTY

(a) Teaching. (List faculty members who teach the courses named in 4, above. Include departmental affiliation if other than your department.)

(b) Research. (List research staff members whose work is related to the areas outlined in 4 or 6, above.)

Signature _____

Position _____